FIDE ET VIRTUTE

W. E. Gladstone

St. Deiniol's Library
Hawarden, Clwyd
Founded by
The Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone

ST. DEINIOL'S LIBRARY
HAWARDEN.

Prehistoric Archæology
and
The Old Testament

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/prehistoricarcha0000hjdu

Prehistoric Archæology
and
The Old Testament

Being the Donnellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin in 1906–1907

Enlarged, and with Notes and Appendices

By

H. J. Dukinfield Astley, M.A., Litt.D.
F.R.Hist.S., F.R.S.L., Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute
Late Hon. Editorial Secretary of the British Archæological Association, Etc. Etc.
Vicar of East and West Rudham, Norfolk

Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street
1908

Cancelled from Gladstone's Library
18 JUN 2024
GLADSTONE'S LIBRARY

11
16

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

HAWARDEN.

[*All Rights reserved.*]

TO

EDWARD DOWDEN

M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D.

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH LITERATURE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN

I DEDICATE THESE LECTURES

IN ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF HIS ENCOURAGEMENT

AND SUPPORT

DISCIPULUS MAGISTRO

AMICUS AMICO

GRATIAS IMMORTALES AGIT

PREFACE

THE aim of the following Lectures is to trace the course and progress of modern scientific discovery in regard to the earth and man, and the position of the latter as the last and final issue of the evolutionary process, which, under the informing presence and power of God, immanent yet transcendent, has brought him and all things into existence. However much this presentation may differ from ideas derived from a pre-scientific era, the endeavour is made to show that in the results attained by a study of the ancient Scriptures of Israel under the light of the Higher Criticism, a method may be discovered which shall enable science and religion to meet and clasp hands.

In one word, the truth of the Christian religion and of the revelation of Jesus Christ, the place of the Church as the appointed channel whereby grace is conveyed from God to man, and of the Sacraments as the vehicles and means of grace, is shown not to be bound up with the Jewish cosmogony nor with a literal acceptance as historical facts of the legends in which the poets and prophets of Israel figured to themselves the origin and first development of the story of man, and of their own history.

The development of this theme has been outlined in the first Lecture, and need not be further insisted upon here.

The author does not venture to lay claim to originality except in the method of presentation, nor to expert knowledge except in the sphere of Prehistoric Archæology and Anthropology, while a study of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament extending over many years gives him some claim to speak with authority on that subject; but if in the course of these Lectures he has been able to throw any fresh light on the difficult problems with which he deals—light which shall help any who feel perplexed by the effort to reconcile the anthropological and the theological views of the origin and constitution of man, and of the nature of sin—he will be more than repaid.

At the same time, he desires specially to address those teachers of religion who frighten away seekers after truth by making it consist in adherence to antiquated notions and outworn dogmas; and in this connection he cannot do better than quote the glowing words in which Fogazzaro makes Benedetto, in *Il Santo*, address the Holy Father — alas, as recent pronouncements have shown, in vain: "Worshippers of the letter, they wish to force grown men to exist upon a diet fit for infants, which diet grown men refuse. They do not understand that although God is infinite and unchangeable, man's conception of Him becomes ever greater from century to century, and that the same may be said of all Divine Truth. . . . Speak one word, Holy Father, before

the whole Church . . . counsel expounders and theologians to advance prudently, for science, in order to progress, must be prudent; but do not allow men who are an honour to the Church, men whose minds are full of truth, whose hearts are full of Christ, who fight in defence of the Catholic faith, to be condemned. Those who would condemn them are worshippers of the past; they wish to remain immovable in the Church, even to maintaining senseless traditions, which expose us to the derision of unbelievers, and this is a great sin in God's sight."

In conclusion, the author would associate himself with words lately written by Mr. A. C. Benson, in which his own position is more ably and eloquently set forth than in any which he could choose for himself; they will be found in the *Cornhill Magazine*, August 1907:—

"Far from desiring to minimise faith in God and the Unseen, I think it is the thing of which the world is more in need than anything else. What has made the path of faith a steep one to tread, is partly that it has got terribly encumbered with ecclesiastical traditions; it has been mended, like the Slough of Despond, with cartloads of texts and insecure definitions. And partly, too, the old simple undisturbed faith in the absolute truth and authority of the Bible has given way. It is admitted that the Bible contains a considerable admixture of the legendary element; and it requires a strong intellectual and moral grip to build one's faith upon a collection of writings, some of which, at all events,

are not now regarded as being historically and literally true. 'If I cannot believe it all,' says the simple bewildered soul, 'how can I be certain that any of it is indubitably true?' Only the patient and desirous spirit can decide; but whatever else fades, the perfect insight, the Divine message of the Son of Man cannot fade; the dimmer that the historical setting becomes, the brighter shine the parables and the sayings, so far beyond the power of His followers to have originated, so utterly satisfying to our deepest needs. What I desire to say with all my heart is that we pilgrims need not be dismayed because the golden clue dips into darkness and mist; it emerges as bright as ever upon the upward slope of the valley. If one disregards all that is uncertain, all that cannot be held to be securely proved in the Sacred Writings, there still remain the essential facts of the Christian revelation, and more deep and fruitful principles than a man can keep and make his own in the course of a lifetime, however purely and faithfully he lives and strives. To myself the doubtful matters are things absolutely immaterial, like the débris of the mine, while the precious ore gleams and sparkles in every boulder."

H. J. DUKINFIELD ASTLEY.

East Rudham,
Christmas 1907.

CONTENTS

LECTURE		PAGE
I.	Genesis and Science: Astronomy and Geology	1
II.	Genesis and Science: Biology and the Theory of Evolution	41
III.	Genesis and Science: The Antiquity of Man	89
IV.	The Origin and Development of Religious Belief	131
V.	The Religion of Old Israel	171
VI.	Anthropology and the Christian Revelation	213
Appendices—		
I.	The Higher Criticism and Christian Teaching	273
II.	The Higher Criticism and the Miraculous	288
III.	Frames of Mind	294
IV.	Reasons for signing the "Declaration on Biblical Criticism"	298
Bibliography		303
Index		309

LECTURE THE FIRST

GENESIS AND SCIENCE: ASTRONOMY AND GEOLOGY

"'In a beginning God
Made heaven and earth.' Forth flashed
Knowledge: from star to clod
Man knew things: doubt abashed
Closed its long period.
. . . . . In flowed
Ever resistless fact:
No more than the passive clay
Disputes the potter's act,
Could the whelmed mind disobey
Knowledge the cataract.
. . . . . .
Then life is—to wake not sleep,
Rise and not rest, but press
From earth's level where blindly creep
Things perfected, more or less,
To the heaven's height, far and steep,

Where, amid what strifes and storms
May wait the adventurous quest,
Power is Love—transports, transforms
Who aspired from worst to best,
Sought the soul's world, spurned the worms'.

I have faith such end shall be:
From the first, Power was—I knew.
Life has made clear to me
That, strive but for closer view,
Love were as plain to see.

When see? When there dawns a day,
If not on the homely earth,
Then yonder, worlds away,
Where the strange and new have birth,
And Power comes full in play."

BROWNING, *Asolando, Reverie.*

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
And God fulfils Himself in many ways."

TENNYSON.

LECTURE THE FIRST

In the 102nd Psalm the Hebrew poet contrasts the majesty, the eternity, and the unchangeableness of God with the fleeting and changing character of the world that He has made; in the 104th Psalm another poet pours forth his soul in a glorious Hymn of Creation. This latter is a poetic version of the first and second chapters of Genesis, and was written when these records of the origins of the Heavens and the Earth which are placed in the forefront of Hebrew literature had already taken the form in which they have come down to us. Into the question as to when that period was, our investigation will be directed in the course of this inquiry; for the present it is enough to point out the dominant idea in the mind of the later Hebrew poets and writers.

This was, as is evident to the most superficial reader, the conviction, firm, settled, and unshakeable, that behind all the transitory phenomena of the Universe there was to be discerned the creative energy and the guiding and directing will and purpose of the Divine Being. With this thought

the soul of the Hebrew poet and prophet was penetrated through and through, and it finds utterance again and again in glowing and impassioned language. Listen to the 2nd Isaiah as he describes the God of Israel addressing His people: "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: He calleth them all by names by the greatness of His might, for that He is strong in power; not one faileth." "Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, Yahweh, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of His understanding" (Isa. xl. 12–29).

Whence did the great orators and writers of Israel derive this grand thought? From what sources did it spring? Was it original or was it derived, and if derived, whence came it, and how had the Hebrew writers arrived at it? We shall endeavour to answer this question later on; here at least we may say that in their expression of it we have an all-sufficient proof of their inspiration, the evidence that they spoke by the impulse of a divine revelation in their souls. This is the great message of Israel, at the latest stage of her development, to the world: God the Creator, the Sustainer, of the Universe, distinct from it in His eternal Personality, yet its abiding

Light and Life; and nothing that modern science or modern criticism can say can impair the value of this great inheritance. The idea as enunciated by the later Hebrew writers was the outcome of a long process of evolution—of training, as we believe, by God Himself, and in the fulness of time the stage attained by Israel's greatest thinkers was surpassed in the Christian revelation, which finally took shape in the dogma of the Trinity, the triune God—One God in three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—implied in the teaching of Jesus Christ, implied in the Christology of St. Paul and St. John, and finally formulated, after a long road had been traversed, as has been shown by Harnack in his *History of Dogma*, in the theology of Nicæa and the later Church. The Hebrew looked out upon the heavens above and the earth beneath, and he beheld the great dichotomy, God and the Universe: the Christian surveys the same scene, and he beholds what may be described as the true Monism, to use a word to be explained later, *i.e.* all things united in the person of the Eternal Christ, the Son, the Word, of the Father, who appeared in time as Man, and who is yet He by whom all things were made, and in whom all things, through all changes, find their fixed point and stability.

In the language of St. Paul, He "is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation: for by Him were all things created that are in

heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible; . . . all things were created by Him and for Him, and He is before all things, and in Him all things consist"; and in the language of the Fourth Gospel, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him."

The expression and phraseology of the thought may be Alexandrian, but it is only the putting into concrete form of the Hebrew poet's declaration, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth."

Whether Christian theology was justified in associating the person of the historic Jesus of Nazareth with these high statements, and making Him, as the glorified Christ of St. Paul, the equivalent of the Logos, the Word, of God, is not the question before us now, nor has science anything to say on the subject either for it or against it. As an example of the trend of modern thought I will quote here the words of a writer in the *Hibbert Journal* (July 1906), who, although some of the conclusions drawn in the course of his paper are considerably more advanced than those I would myself draw, must yet be reckoned with. His article is entitled "Why not face the Facts?" and in it the writer says: "It is hopeless to attempt to understand the New Testament, or the history of Christianity, or the needs of our time, so

long as we continue to confound Jesus with the Christ :—the first, an historic figure of the first century; the second, a reflection of the historic figure, in which there is always of necessity a subjective element. The Christ is the increment of Jesus, the person expanding into an ideal. The Christ of medievalism drew its elements from medieval life. The Christ of the Nicene period was a Logos-Christ. The Christ of Matthew Arnold is a modern apostle of sweetness and light. Men cannot get away from themselves, do what they will, and their Christ is the expression of their own ideal; the work which they conceive Him as doing is the work which they think necessary to be done." And again: "It must be constantly borne in mind that whenever men begin to set forth their Christ, it is an ideal either of themselves or of someone they deeply revere and love. It cannot be otherwise. 'An ideal necessarily mingles with all conceptions of Christ,' said Jowett; 'why should we object to a Christ who is necessarily ideal? Do persons really suppose that they know Christ as they know a living friend? Is not Christ in the Sacrament, Christ at the right hand of God, Christ in you the hope of glory, an ideal? Have not the disciples of Christ, from the age of Paul onwards, been always idealising this memory?' How true these words are, and how simple; yet how much dogmatism would disappear were they

frankly accepted. The worst of all dogmatisms, and the most inveterate, is that which claims that its own ideal of Christ is the (only) right one. How fortunate that dogmatism about the actual Jesus is not possible! He is only partially known to us; 'enough to assist us, but not enough to constrain us,' as Jowett goes on to say. . . . It is just because the details of the life of Jesus are so meagre that the ideal of the Christ has grown around it—giving it in the first place a location and a name, and, in the second place, finding for it new organs of expression in every age, developing new powers, and assimilating new elements of human life as that life grows richer and deeper."

This is all very true, but what this writer appears to forget is the fact that this very idealising of "the Christ" is only possible in the subjective consciousness of the Church and of Christians throughout the ages, on account of the unique impression which Jesus of Nazareth made upon His contemporaries, leading some to follow Him with adoring love and worship through persecutions to a martyr's death, while others hated Him with a deadly hatred springing from a feeling of the condemnation of their lives and doings involved in His life and teachings; and through the records handed down by His followers and their successors, and the ever-abiding witness of the Church, that impression has been transmitted to our day.

It is because Jesus of Nazareth was unique, because He was, and is, as we reverently believe, the only-begotten Son of God, that the idealising of His figure into the glorified Christ of St. Paul, and the identifying of Him with the Logos of St. John, under the guiding inspiration of the Holy Ghost, the third Person in the ever-blessed Trinity, and all that He has been to the Church and to individual believers from the first days until now, becomes possible. (Cf. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, pp. 378–382 *et sqq.*)

The same process which we see at work in the development of the figure of the ideal Christ out of the historic figure of Jesus of Nazareth was at work through all the ages in the development of the idea of God from the first glimmering consciousness of mankind, which we of to-day can study in the savage peoples who survive, up to its great expression in the later prophets of Israel, and its admission by the greatest thinkers and philosophers and scientists of the present time. In each case it is the objective reality behind that makes the subjective ideal possible; *i.e.*, it is God Himself who has been teaching mankind, in all races a little, in one race, and through that race, the world, more fully to know Him, and in this consists His revelation to mankind.

Thus the *idea* of God in the mind of man grew and advanced, by a process of orderly evolu-

tion, such as marks everything else in His universe; and we can trace this evolution through the progressive stages of revelation until we arrive at the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, which itself is, after all, only an inadequate presentation of the Real. It is in the tracing out of the growth of this idea that the critical study of the Old Testament provides an indispensable aid in the arranging of the documents in their correct order and sequence, one of the criteria of which is provided by paying attention to this very circumstance.

As we study the progress of the idea of God in the Old Testament, we shall find that in its beginnings it followed the precise lines characteristic of all primitive peoples. The Yahweh of Gen. iii. is hardly to be distinguished from Baiame or Daramulun of the Australians, or Unkulunkulu of the Zulus. The Yahweh of early Israel is the national god, just as Chemosh is the national god of Moab, and he is often cruel, vindictive, and jealous; when Israel takes full possession of Canaan, her national god becomes lord of the land, the Baal *par excellence*, having ousted all the Canaanite Baals, and is worshipped largely with their rites and at their shrines. With the Deuteronomists and the earlier prophets, Yahweh is on the way to becoming the One God of the whole earth; and the holiness of God, which in its origin was connected with ideas of separation and taboo, has taken on an ethical

significance, while Israel is a holy, *i.e. separated*, people, dedicated to the sole worship of Yahweh, and called to be holy because He is holy.

From this stage it is an easy advance to the full monotheistic faith of the later prophets and psalmists, as referred to above, and the way is prepared for the fuller revelation still of God in Christ, which could only find its complete expression in the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, as developed in the New Testament.

To this the Jewish people were providentially guided by the will and purpose of God Himself, while other races and nations remained at varying stages of inadequate expression of the idea, whether in the stages of animism, fetishism, or polytheism, through all of which Israel or her ancestors passed, as we shall see later on, but which she left behind; and in this consists her revelation and the inspiration of her literature.

Thus, in these Lectures, we take it for a revealed truth that God exists, that the Universe is not self-existent, but proceeds from the hand of God, and that God both transcends, as against the Pantheist, and is immanent in, as against the Deist, the Universe He has called into being.

In other words, we approach the subject of these Lectures as firm believers in the Christian creed, while admitting that there are many points in which the hitherto prevalent understanding of that

creed needs modification, in deference to the new knowledge of our age. In this we are only following the line which God Himself marked out from the beginning in the progressive stages of His revelation of Himself to man, dealing with him as a child before He could deal with him as an adult—"precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little and there a little" (Isa. xxviii. 13).

With these preliminary observations, we proceed to the more immediate subject of these Lectures. This may be briefly stated as an investigation, on the basis of the Jewish and Christian revelation, as set forth above, of the question as to how far we are enabled by the science of modern historical criticism to adjust our conceptions of the origin of man and of the religious principles of mankind to the facts which have been brought to light by the newly developed sciences of prehistoric Archæology and Anthropology; *i.e.*, the study of primitive man in antiquity, and as manifested in the savage races of the present day, even as we have been compelled by the sciences of Astronomy, Geology, and Biology to modify our ideas as to the origin of the Universe, of the earth, and of life upon the earth. Many and various are the attempts that have been made to seek this adjustment while still holding to the pre-critical view of the Old Testament, but it is my

firm conviction that in the one case as in the other the only true solution is to be found in accepting the light which is thrown upon the ancient literature contained in the Old Testament Scriptures by a scientific study of the books of which they are composed, and by allowing these books to take their place as one among the great literatures of the world, and to tell their own story of their origin and development.

The remainder of this Lecture will be devoted to a study of the modifications necessitated in the old theology by the teachings of Astronomy and of Geology, and the efforts made to adjust the teachings of these sciences to a literal interpretation of the first two chapters of Genesis. The second Lecture will treat of the rise of the science of Biology with its concomitant results in the doctrine of Evolution through Natural Selection conditioned by heredity and environment. The third Lecture brings us to the science of prehistoric Archæology and the antiquity of man, together with a view of his advance from the earliest Stone Age down to the historic period. The fourth Lecture will deal with the science of Anthropology and the Origin of Religion, giving a survey of the progress of the race from the lowest savagery through barbarism to civilisation from the scientific point of view, and illustrating the condition of primeval man by the ideas and customs of present-day savages. The

fifth Lecture will deal with the results of the modern historical criticism of the Old Testament and with the religion of Israel down to and including the eighth century B.C.; and the last Lecture will carry on the story through the Deuteronomists and the Priestly Code, the times of Josiah and the Exile, on to the establishment of Judaism, demonstrating the progressive character of the Old Testament revelation till it culminated in the manifestation of the Christ. Thus it will be shown that a right understanding of the Old and New Testament Scriptures in the light of the truths as to their origin which they themselves furnish when subjected to a patient and reverent investigation provides a method whereby the underlying harmony between science and revelation, both of them in their essence divine, may be brought out, with special reference to the doctrines of the Fall and of original and actual sin in the light of the anthropological view of man's origin and constitution. All truth is one even as God is one, and the varying and seemingly at times discordant notes which reach the inquirer's ear are but the chords which combine to make up the majestic and eternal music of the spheres; and as we follow the strains of this celestial orchestra, we find ourselves insensibly but inevitably pursuing the path trodden by Hebrew poets and prophets of old, and we are drawn ever onward and upward till we reach the summit of

those "great altar-stairs which slope through darkness up to God."

The subject to which we propose to address ourselves in this course of Lectures is thus, as will be seen, very wide—too wide, it may be said, to be attempted by one individual in one short series of discourses; and where so many wise and great men have seen nothing but divergences and differences and separation, is it to be supposed that we may be fortunate enough to discover the really underlying harmony? It may be we are too bold, but the attempt is worth making from the point of view both of science and of religion, and to fail even in a great cause is better than to succeed in a poor one!

> "That low man seeks a little thing to do,
> Sees it and does it:
> This high man, with a great thing to pursue,
> Dies ere he knows it.
> That has the world here—should he need the next,
> Let the world mind him!
> This throws himself on God, and unperplexed
> Seeking shall find Him."
>
> BROWNING, *A Grammarian's Funeral.*

I do not deprecate any criticism, provided it is honest and impartial; I only ask that those who cling to antiquated methods of interpreting the Scriptures will at least admit the difficulty of harmonising these with the plain facts which modern investigation of the Universe, of Nature, and of Man have brought to light, and ask them-

selves what is to be their position in view of these facts. Surely this is a wiser and better method than to attempt to shut one's eyes to the facts altogether, and continue in happy ignorance, as so many do; or, like the ostrich, to bury one's head in the sands of prejudice, while all the time the field is left open to those who say, "These are the facts; your interpretation of the Bible is entirely opposed to them; so much the worse for the Bible."

The field is wide, and we can attempt no more than a broad, but, it is to be hoped, not the less useful, survey. As regards the greater part of the ground to be covered, I cannot pretend to give more than the results of other men's labours; but in that portion comprised under the terms of Anthropology and prehistoric Archæology I can give the results of my own research, and with these I can combine the results of studies extending now over many years in the literature of Old Testament criticism. I have found the latter throw a flood of light over what was dark and inexplicable in the former when seen from the viewpoint of the old theology, and it is my earnest desire and prayer that what may be said in the course of these Lectures may be the means of affording help to some who have perhaps been troubled by the same difficulties which formerly perplexed myself.

To anyone who casts his eyes back over the last sixty years it is evident that in the opening period of Queen Victoria's reign all things were still to a considerable extent as they had been from the beginning in the theological world. It was to all intents and purposes, from a modern point of view, a pre-scientific era; but the mutterings of the coming storm were commencing to make themselves heard. Herbert Spencer was planning the principles of his Synthetic Philosophy, and Charles Darwin was thinking out the doctrine of Evolution by Natural Selection, but the dovecotes were still at rest, for the sciences of Anthropology and prehistoric Archæology were unborn.

It is true that a really literal interpretation of the first two chapters of Genesis was even then no longer possible, for since the day when modern Astronomy was born, with the discoveries of Galileo and the succeeding work of Copernicus, Kepler, and Sir Isaac Newton, down to Laplace and Herschel, the ancient view of the Universe was no longer tenable.

For what was this view, which a truly literal interpretation, not only of these two chapters, but of the whole Jewish literature, necessitates—a view held by St. Paul, and prevalent in some form even after the promulgation of the Ptolemaic cosmogonies down to the close of the medieval period?

It was that the earth was at the centre of a vast revolving sphere, itself settled on firm foundations, "which never could be moved at any time" (what these were laid upon did not appear, for the Hebrews never formulated their ideas to the extent that the Hindus did, when they placed the earth upon an elephant, the elephant on a tortoise, and so on); over the earth was spread a solid firmament, on the other side of which were stored up the waters which are above the firmament, and in which sun, moon, and stars have been set as light-bearers to the earth, while when the rain falls it is because the windows, or trap-doors, in the firmament have been opened.

In early Hebrew thought, Yahweh, the tribal god, was represented sometimes as having his abode in Sinai; sometimes, in accordance with Assyrian and Babylonian ideas, in the mountains of the North; and later, when Yahweh had become the God of the whole earth, He was represented as having His earthly abode in Mount Zion, while His real dwelling-place was above the firmament, in what afterwards became Heaven.

Under the earth lay the dark and dismal realms of Sheôl, the dwelling of the cold shades of the departed, whither men go when they die, to which they are sometimes dismissed by the earth opening her mouth and swallowing them up alive, and whence the spirits of the departed can be

summoned by necromancy and witchcraft to impart tidings for good or ill to men whose souls are perplexed with the shadow of impending disaster.

There also, or down in still deeper depths, dwell Satan and his host of fallen angels—but this is a somewhat late development from Babylonian mythology.

Passing over later Jewish developments, let us see with what eyes St. Paul, a representative Pharisee, looked out upon the Universe after he had become a Christian apostle. "To him, as to his people," says Professor Weinel, in his study of *St. Paul: the Man and his Work*, "the world appears as a three-storeyed building: the lowest storey is the realm of the dead; above this the terrestrial world; and over it, heaven with its inhabitants. Heaven is a space, an arched dome, from the midst of which Christ appears, within which God dwells, surrounded by angels and spirits. There are several heavenly domes one above another, 'with many mansions,' in which even the glorified bodies of the redeemed are already at rest. Paul himself has once been in the third heaven and in Paradise, which latter, according to the passage in question and according to other contemporary indications, must have been conceived as situated in one of the various heavens. This earth is a small place. Between the pillars of Hercules and the Indies are con-

tained all that on earth shall bow the knee before the Lord."[1]

From this point of view it is easy to understand the early Christian notion of the physical ascent of the risen and glorified Saviour into "the heavens," and how it was that St. Stephen saw Him standing on the right hand of God, when "the heavens were opened," and how he appeared in the flash of blinding light to Saul the Persecutor on the road to Damascus.

Now all these ideas and the fixed cosmogony which they represent are of the greatest interest when viewed in the light of their origin and of a comparative study of the primitive conceptions of the human race, but as a revelation of literal facts they received their deathblow from the moment that Galileo discovered that the earth is merely one of the planetary spheres in the solar system, and faced his persecutors with the epoch-marking declaration: "E pur si muove."

What is true of Astronomy is true also of Geology, which, in the early-Victorian period, had already won its way to recognition.

Even as late as the seventeenth century Bishop Pearson could say, in his *Exposition of the Creed*, "Heaven and earth were most certainly created within not more than six, or, at the farthest, seven thousand years" from the age in which he

[1] Weinel's *St. Paul: the Man and his Work*, pp. 24, 25.

was writing. Voltaire, in the eighteenth century, could regard the sea-shells which were found high up on Alpine ridges as relics of the Noachian Deluge; but by 1840 it was seen that just as Astronomy previously, so Geology also necessitated a modification, an adjustment, in the literal interpretation of what had been hitherto looked upon as a primeval revelation to mankind.

Astronomy had shown that so far from it being possible that sun, moon, and stars (the latter in their innumerable array being all included together in one insignificant phrase) should have been the work of a fourth day of Creation, the solar system itself is but an infinitesimal unit in the vast conglomerate of the Universe, and that unnumbered ages have been required since the period when it was a nebulous mass until it arrived at its present condition. As Dr. Driver points out in his *Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, "Astronomers, by the study and comparison of the heavenly bodies, have risen to the conception of a theory explaining by the aid of known mechanical and physical principles, the formation of the earth itself. The solar system—*i.e.*, the sun, earth, and other planets with their satellites—existed once as a diffused gaseous mass, or nebula, of immense dimensions, which gradually condensed and became a rotating sphere; and from this in rotation the different planets were

flung off, while the remainder was more and more concentrated, till it became what we call the sun. One of these planets, the earth, in process of time, by reduction of temperature and other changes, developed the conditions adequate for the support of life. The time occupied by all these processes cannot of course be estimated with any precision, but it will in any case have embraced millions of years: a recent work on astronomy places the time at which the moon was thus flung off from the then liquid earth" (and, say some, from that portion which is now the Pacific Ocean) "at about 57,000,000 years ago."[1]

Nor is this all. What Astronomy has done for the Universe at large and for the solar system in particular, Geology has done for the earth on which we live. To quote Professor Driver again: "Geology has disclosed by testimony which cannot be gainsaid, the immense antiquity of the earth. The earth, as we now know, reached its present state, and acquired its rich and wonderful adornment of vegetable and animal life, by a gradual process, extending over countless centuries, and embracing unnumbered generations of living forms. Those white cliffs which rise out of the sea on our northern coasts, when examined by the microscope, are seen to consist mostly of the

[1] Driver's *Genesis*, p. 20.

minute shells of marine organisms, deposited at the rate of a few inches a century at the bottom of the ocean, and afterwards, by some great upheaval of the earth's crust, lifted high above the waves. Our coal measures are the remains of mighty forests, which have slowly come and gone upon certain parts of the earth's surface, and have stored up the energy, poured forth during long ages from the sun, for our consumption and enjoyment. These and other formations contain, moreover, numerous fossil remains; and so geologists have been able to determine the order in which, during the slowly passing ages of their growth, higher and higher types of vegetable and animal life were ever appearing upon the globe."[1]

All this was already beginning to be apparent in the early-Victorian period, and all manner of efforts were being made to adjust the ascertained facts of science to a supposed literal revelation to Moses of the facts of Creation. These efforts have not altogether ceased in some quarters even now, though their futility in the light of the teaching of Evolution and Biology and Anthropology becomes, as will be seen later, ever more and more pronounced.

On the one hand it was advanced that the "days" of Gen. i. represented long periods, on the analogy of Ps. xc. 4, 2 Pet. iii. 8, "One

[1] Driver's *Genesis*, p. 20.

day is with the Lord as a thousand years," and various attempts were made to adjust the work of Creation as described in Genesis with the order of succession of the geologic periods, while the creation of light on the first day was supposed to represent a sort of zodiacal light which diffused itself throughout the Universe, and the creation of the sun, moon, and stars on the fourth day was supposed to represent the concentration of light in the various heavenly bodies, with a special view to their usefulness to the earth—"the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night. He made the stars also." This theory is particularly connected with the names of Buckland in his Bridgewater Treatise, and later with Sir J. W. Dawson.

Another method by which it was attempted to maintain the literal accuracy of the so-called Mosaic cosmogony was by the ingenious device of imagining a hiatus of unlimited extent and duration between the first and second verses of Gen. i. The first verse, so it was said, describes in general terms the creation of all things—the heavens and the earth—by God; with the second verse begins an account of the preparation of the earth, which had fallen into a condition of chaos, apparently at the close of the geologic periods, for the abode of man, and this took place in a space of six days about six or seven thousand

years ago. "But neither so did their witness agree together," for this explanation had the misfortune to agree neither with science nor the Biblical narrative, for it could not be brought into harmony with the latter without a violent wresting of its plain and literal meaning, and science knew nothing of any hiatus in the geologic periods, nor of any lapse of the earth into chaos, from which state it needed to be freshly and specially prepared for man; moreover, the discoveries of M. Boucher de Perthes and others, on which we shall presently enlarge, were beginning more and more to throw back the beginnings of the human race into the far distant past. This theory was advocated by Kurtz and Dr. Chalmers.

Yet a third method of solving the difficulty was found in the so-called "vision" theory, by which it was supposed that the course and method of Creation was revealed to Moses in a sort of moving panorama, either when he was on Mount Sinai, or when he was in the cleft of the rock and the glory of the Lord passed by him, and that he afterwards wrote down the vision as he had seen it. This theory, which was ably set out by Hugh Miller in *The Testimony of the Rocks*, need not detain us long, for it is only possible on the supposition that Moses was the author of this account of Creation, and with the dissipation of that supposition it at once falls to the ground. It is only

interesting as showing the expedients to which men will resort whose preconceived prejudices (and want of knowledge) prevent them from being capable of allowing the documents to tell the true story of their origin and significance.

The whole *raison d'être* of these and other such attempts to preserve the literal accuracy of the Mosaic account or to harmonise it with the teachings of Astronomy and Geology in such a manner as to seem to preserve its character as a revelation by sacrificing something of the literal meaning which the words bore on the face of them, was undertaken in the interests of theology. It was felt that, at all hazards, the doctrines which Christianity from the beginning had taught with respect to God and Man, Angels and Devils, Heaven and Hell, the Fall and Redemption, must be true and must be upheld. The solar system might indeed be but a speck in the mighty Universe of worlds, the earth might be a globe revolving with her sister planets round the sun, unnumbered ages might have passed since first the molten mass cooled down and the crust of the earth began to be formed, countless centuries might have elapsed since life first showed itself, the succession of the stratified rocks, and the order in which living plants and animated creatures appeared might even be correctly described by Geology, but man at least stood

alone. Man at least was a special creation. Man "was made in the image of God" by a special act of creative power, and the first man was so glorious in his perfections, that, in the language of Bishop South, "Plato and Aristotle are but the rubbish of an Adam, and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise."

It is not to be wondered at that a firm and determined stand was made here, for the whole system of theology hung together, and it was felt that to make a breach in the system at this point was to threaten the whole scheme of revealed religion with destruction.

Thus, long after theologians had been driven from their outworks, and even down to the present day, as witness Professor Orr's recent book, *God's Image in Man and its Defacement in the Light of Modern Denials*, they took their stand here.

Adam was our first forefather, brought into existence innocent if not perfect. The story of Paradise, of Adam and Eve, of the Trees of Life, and of Knowledge of Good and Evil, the Serpent-Tempter, the primal curse and the promised deliverance, the accounts of the antediluvians and of the Noachian Deluge, are all literal history enacted within the space of six thousand years; original sin is the inheritance bequeathed by Adam to the race descended from him, and through original sin man is very far gone from original righteousness.

If all this be not literally true, then the scheme of redemption and the Person of the Redeemer lose their intention and their significance.

Thus it was argued, and timid souls, whose eyes were beginning to be opened, were frightened; shrinking on the verge of unknown dangers, and feeling that the faith on which their hopes depended for time and for eternity was slipping from under their feet, they made their trembling appeal to Heaven, "If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?"

And they did right to shrink and hesitate if Christianity is bound up with the literal truth of these stories; the scheme which had been developed by theologians out of the premiss that they are literally true was a compact, a logical, and a systematic whole, and it seemed that no stone could be removed without bringing the whole structure to the ground.

But to place the defence of Christianity on the hypothesis of the literal truth of these stories is to place it on a wrong basis altogether. For, as we shall see, they are not, and were not intended to be taken as, literally true.

They are part and parcel, and a precious part and parcel, of the Hebrew literature, taking their place with the cosmogonies and folklore of kindred peoples, aye, and of races widely scattered over the surface of the globe, part of the poetry of the

Hebrew race, even as are also the stories of the patriarchs and of the wilderness wanderings, of Balaam and his ass, of the sun and moon standing still over the vale of Ajalon, of Samson and other heroes of the great period of the Judges. They bring before us Israel's picture of her past, of her origin and of the origin of the human race, and they are a divine revelation because they enshrine precious truths and precious lessons which man might never otherwise have learnt, or, at any rate, which God did not intend that man should learn in any other way.[1]

These early narratives teach us, not in myth or in allegory, but in stories which are eternally true to poetry, if not to fact, stories which derive their substance from the earliest imaginings of the race, as in Gen. ii., iii., the ideas which possessed a special people at a special period as to the progress of creation and man's place in nature, and as to how he was thought to have arrived at the condition in which all experience finds him—a being of weak will, biassed to wrong-doing, and in consequence subject to sorrow, suffering, pain, and death. Behind this present phase of his existence there lay, so thought these poets of the Hebrew race, a golden age when man walked the earth with head erect, the conscious and favoured son of God, dwelling in a beautiful garden, in which were to be

[1] See Note A, p. 33.

found all that could delight the senses and conduce to happiness. These poets of Israel were not alone in their imaginings, nor were they original. Among all races are found fond dream-pictures of a golden age, and the garden, the trees, the serpent have their place therein. Even among savages so low as the native Australians we find the tradition of the Alcheringa times, of which the present is but a debased and feeble copy.

Upon the Hebrew version of the Babylonian story theology has built its vast superstructure of the Fall and original sin and all that it involves.

On the other hand, the sciences of Anthropology and prehistoric Archæology teach us, as we shall see, that man derives his ancestry from a long line of animal predecessors—that, in fact, there is an unbroken, or practically unbroken, succession of ever-advancing life-forms from the first living cell till man at length appears, and that, in consequence, man comes into the world bringing with him all the inherited tendencies of his ancestry, but that in spite of them his course, at least as regards the higher and more favoured races, has been constantly upward, aiming at an ever increasing growth in the complexity of civilised life, and a higher standard of ethical attainments and conduct. How to bring this new view of man's place in nature and of his upward progress into relationship with the old theology, and how to gather from these

primitive stories the truths they undoubtedly convey, we shall endeavour to show after we have traversed the course of this inquiry—and have discovered not only what Biology, Anthropology, and prehistoric Archæology, but also what a critical study of the Hebrew Scriptures, have to teach.

Here it may suffice to point out that if man comes into the world with a heritage of tendencies derived from his animal ancestry, it is easy to see that each individual human being no sooner awakes to consciousness than the possibilities of yielding to these spring to life in the following of his own will; and through the combined influences of what we have learnt to call heredity and environment, but which, in the case of man, may equally well be called by the old names of original sin and outward circumstance, he falls into the actual commission of evil. Being a creature of weak will and biassed to the lower rather than the higher choice, he needs help if he would rise, and this help is what man has ever been seeking under all forms and varieties of religion. Moreover, man has realised that his actual sins, if not his hereditary tendencies, merit punishment, and this he has ever striven to avert by sacrifice.

All that man needs and has striven after is supplied in the gospel of Jesus Christ, in which the gropings and yearnings of mankind find their fulfilment, in a higher and better way than the old

theology dreamed of; for here we have revealed a Father who cares for the struggling, erring child, who gives him pardon for his faults and failings, and helps him to rise ever higher, by uniting Himself to the race in the Person of His Son; and through sacramental union with Him, under the overshadowing, and through the indwelling, influence of the Holy Ghost, man is led along the road that shall at last conduct him to a life of perfected harmony with the will of God in the ages to come.

This is Christianity,[1] and it is independent alike of the "scheme of redemption" propounded by the Schools, and of that literal interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis and of other Hebrew Scriptures with which it has been too hastily bound up.

The message, then, that we have to deliver, a message which this whole course is intended to convey, is this: that Christianity, regarded in the light of the fuller understanding of the Universe and of man which it is the privilege of this present age to enjoy, has nothing to fear from the facts which are taught by science, nor from the fuller understanding of those ancient Scriptures which a study of their origin and intent bestows.

[1] Cf. Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, published in English by Williams & Norgate under the title, *What is Christianity?* and Weinel, *St. Paul: the Man and his Work*, p. 11.

NOTE A, p. 29.

"One is disposed, futile and perhaps wrong as the feeling may be, to regret that the early Church, beginning with St. Paul, was so fully determined to baptize into Christ the Jewish cosmogony. True though it be that the account of the creation in *Genesis*, when compared either with the parallel tales which have in recent years been discovered on the clay tablets of Babylon, or the stories of Greek mythology, show a nobler religious tinge, yet one cannot but see how far astray the Church has been led by her adoption of them in a too literal and prosaic fashion. St. Paul derived from them a doctrine of the Fall, which has had enormous influence on the history of the Church. Whether on the whole that influence has been for good or not we cannot tell, since, if it had not been there, we do not know what would have taken its place. But we see how the survival of the view, amid surroundings to which it is ill adapted, has become an impediment. And from the time of Galileo downwards, almost every great scientific discovery has been regarded by the great authorities of the Church as hostile to Christianity, simply because those authorities cannot cut themselves wholly loose from Jewish primitive views of the nature and the origin of the visible universe, which, one may venture to say, have no more connection with the teaching of Jesus Christ than they have with the dramas of Shakespeare. In this matter, as in all

other phenomena of religion, as well as of politics and ethics, good and evil are intermingled. And it is safest in most cases to think that on the whole, in the long run, good has resulted rather than evil from nearly all the modes of religious belief which have existed in the world. Yet one cannot but feel that there lay ready to hand, even in the Old Testament, a cosmogony with infinitely more natural affinity for Christianity. In a magnificent chapter of *Proverbs*, Wisdom is spoken of as the spirit which presided at the creation of the world. 'When the Lord prepared the heavens, I was there: when He set a compass on the face of the depth: when He established the clouds above: when He strengthened the fountains of the deep: when He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment: when He appointed the foundations of the earth: then I was by Him as a master workman, and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him.' The writer to the Hebrews must have thought of this passage when he wrote, 'The worlds were framed by the word of God,' the word and wisdom being expressions of like meaning. And that Christ was the Word of God was soon believed. The cosmogony of the Fourth Evangelist and of *Proverbs* has in it nothing with which science can quarrel or which is quite worn out with time."—GARDNER, *The Growth of Christianity*, pp. 71, 72.

To the same effect Canon Driver says,—and I cannot improve upon his words:—

"The cosmogony of Genesis is treated in popular

estimation as an integral element of the Christian faith. It cannot be too earnestly represented that this is not the case. A definition of the process by which, after the elements composing it were created, the world assumed its present condition, forms no article in the Christian creed. The Church has never pronounced with authority upon the interpretation of the narrative in Genesis. It is consequently open to the Christian teacher to understand it in the sense which science will permit; and it becomes his duty to understand what that sense is. But, as the Abbé Loisy has justly said, the science of the Bible is the science of the age in which it was written; and to expect to find in it supernatural information on points of scientific fact is to mistake its entire purpose. . . . Upon the false science of antiquity the author has grafted a true and dignified representation of the relation of the world to God. It is not its office to forestall scientific discovery; it neither comes into collision with science nor needs reconciliation with it. It must be read in the light of the age in which it was written; and while the spiritual teaching so vividly expressed by it can never lose its freshness or value, it must on its material side be interpreted in accordance with the place which it holds in the history of Semitic cosmological speculation." [1]

And that which Canon Driver so well expresses

[1] Driver's *Genesis*, p. 33, and see the note, with references given therein. The whole passage from which the above extract is taken is well worth study, and must commend itself to every thoughtful reader.

here, more particularly with respect to Gen. i., must be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, as we shall see, to all the early narratives of Israel.

Again, in the striking words of the writer in the *Hibbert Journal*, July 1906, already quoted, in the article entitled "Why not face the Facts?" we have this point well expressed:—"The truth is that the Churches have never yet really faced the spiritual situation created by the new knowledge of our day. A writer in this *Journal* (Oct. 1905) points out that 'not even yet has the truth of the Copernican astronomy become thoroughly soaked into the substance of Christian thought.'

"The scheme of dogma which has claimed to be the creed of Christendom received its deathblow at the hands of a priest in the middle of the sixteenth century, for every one of the doctrines which make up that creed fit, like a picture into a frame, the universe as known to ancient and mediæval times. That scheme is wholly out of place in the enlarged universe which is taught to our children in every secular school in the land. This is what makes the orthodox creed seem to the average man so much 'in the air.' It grew out of and is dependent upon that exploded scheme of the universe. 'Our religious beliefs,' said Principal Fairbairn, in an early utterance, 'can never be dissociated from our conception of the universe, and as the latter grows larger and finer the former must be transfigured that they may live and shine in the new light.' The call then is loud and clear for the Churches to bring their teaching into harmony

with the larger universe, to make their beliefs a true reflection of it, large with its largeness, deep with its depth, sublime with its sublimity, to front an altered world, to expand to the larger thought of God and of spiritual reality which it gives. This call is yet, as the writer above referred to points out, only partially answered.

"It is true that Copernicus has completely triumphed, but the consequences which follow logically from his new universe are not yet accepted. The result is bewilderment, paralysis of faith, and doubt about the future. The whole framework has vanished in which has been represented the great drama of Redemption as conceived by the mediæval and Reformation Churches—from the Garden of Eden to the Second Advent of Christ. But when this is frankly and thoroughly accepted, it is seen that the larger universe is destructive only of narrow conceptions, which the world can do better without. A new age of faith will come, when the religious instincts of devout souls turn with joy to the new knowledge. Then faith will be not dissonant with things, as many feel it to be now, but harmonious, because it will take form from the larger universe in which it dwells."

This is on the whole very well put, and expresses in clear and forcible language what many are feeling to-day; but the writer allows himself to be led too far when he says that in the enlarged Universe the creed of Christendom is wholly out of place. Certain deductions which the old theology drew

from its scheme of the Universe may have to be abandoned, certain phrases in the Apostles' Creed, for example, may have to be differently explained, but the main outlines of that Creed are eternally true, and the real problem of the age is not to overthrow, but to fit in these previous conceptions to which the Church of old was guided with that larger and nobler Universe which science reveals to us; to this end we seek the aid of a critical study of the Old Testament, which shall show us that the revelation of God is in no way wrapped up with the pre-Copernican view of the Universe.

At the Yarmouth Church Congress in October 1907, the Rev. J. T. Manley read a very able and interesting paper on "How to teach the Old Testament," but it is vitiated by the endeavour to make the statements of Gen. i. "harmonise" with the teachings of science. In this endeavour he is supported by the Rev. Dr. Irving in a correspondence carried out in the *Guardian* during October and November, to which Dr. Driver contributes some telling replies. My own share in this correspondence I subjoin, as bearing out the thesis of these Lectures:—

As one who has given prolonged study to the subject embraced in the heading of this correspondence, may I say how entirely I agree with Professor Driver's letter in your issue of October 23rd? The efforts made by Mr. Manley in his Congress paper at Yarmouth, and of Mr. Irving in your columns last week, to reconcile the statements of the first chapter of Genesis with the ascertained facts of modern science, are most interesting as examples

of mental legerdemain, and as survivals of a method which is fast passing, happily, into the lumber-room of forgotten things, but they have no real bearing on the controversies of the present day.

Science teaches that the earth, and life, and man came into being and attained their present position through the orderly sequence of evolution—an evolution "directed" (to use Professor's Henslow's word), as we Christians believe, by the omnipresent Spirit of the immanent and yet transcendent God; and it is impossible to reconcile the orderly sequence of Nature with the plain statements of the writer of Genesis i. as to the work of the six days of Creation, more particularly the creation of the sun and moon and stars on the fourth day, after light has already shone forth on the first day and life is already flourishing on the earth. And this is not a case for juggling with words or explaining away their clear meaning. Nor is there any necessity for doing or attempting to do so when once the truth as to the early chapters of Genesis is grasped. This has been stated over and over again by students like Professor Driver, the Bishop of Winchester, and others.

Leaving on one side the second and third chapters of Genesis, which preserve the folk-stories and legends of old Israel as they were told by the poets of the eighth century B.C. in the kingdom of Judah, and which present the picture of the "Origins" of the existing condition of things as they were figured in that age, I will confine myself here to the first chapter. This magnificent piece of philosophical speculation—which is sometimes mistaken for poetry—belongs to the latest strata of the documents of the Hexateuch, those known as the Priestly Code, to which it was prefixed as an Introduction. It belongs to the period of the Exile, and emanates from a school of priests who were deeply imbued with Babylonian learning, and who were fully cognisant of the Babylonian cosmogony. Hence the reference to Chaos, and the conflict between the monster Tiâmat and Merodach, the god of light, which characterise the earlier verses; hence also the sevenfold division of time and the importance assigned

to the heavenly bodies, not only as light-givers, but more especially as measurers of time. From this point of view the chapter is most interesting as presenting the perfected scheme of creation as the Jewish thinkers of the fifth century B.C. figured it to themselves; but when one realises that this was its origin and purpose, the futility of attempting any harmonistic scheme of "reconciliation" between its declarations and the teachings of modern science as to "Origins" immediately appears. It is as futile as it would be to attempt to harmonise science with the Brahmanic or Buddhist cosmogonies, or with the fancies of primitive peoples. Moreover, Gen. i. is quite inconsistent with the earlier statements of Gen. ii., with which it was afterwards combined—no harmony being considered necessary by the latest editors. The inspiration of Gen. i. consists in its spiritual teaching, in the fact that animism and polytheism are alike brushed aside in the sublime revelation vouchsafed to Israel of the One omnipotent and eternal God, "who spake, and it was done; who commanded, and it stood fast."

Revelation teaches, and science cannot deny, that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"; both alike teach that man was the ultimate outcome of the creative purpose. Revelation tells of the "whence" and "whither," science of the "how," for revelation was not intended to teach what man's God-given faculties can discover without its aid.—*The Guardian*, Nov. 7, 1907.[1]

[1] Cf. Prof. Darwin's reference to Tyndall's Belfast Address (1874), in his own Address to the British Association in that city in 1902: "His" (Tyndall's) "successors have no longer any need to repeat those significant words, 'We claim and we shall wrest from theology the entire domain of cosmological theory.' The claim has been practically, though often unconsciously, conceded."—*British Association Report*, Belfast, 1902, p. 9.

LECTURE THE SECOND

GENESIS AND SCIENCE: BIOLOGY AND THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting:
The soul that rises with us, our life's star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar;
Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, who is our home."

WORDSWORTH, *Ode on Immortality*.

"The Poet's age is sad: for why?
In youth the natural world could show
No common object but his eye
At once involved with alien glow—
His own soul's iris-bow.

. . . . . .

And now? The lambent flame is—where?
Lost from the naked world: earth, sky,
Hill, vale, tree, flower,—Italia's rare
O'er-running beauty crowds the eye—
But flame! The Bush is bare.

Hill, vale, tree, flower—they stand distinct,
Nature to know and name. What then?
A Voice spoke thence which straight unlinked
Fancy from fact: see, all's in ken:
Has once my eyelid winked?

No, for the purged ear apprehends
Earth's import, not the eye late dazed:
The Voice said, 'Call my works thy friends!
At Nature dost thou shrink amazed?
God is it who transcends.'"

BROWNING, *Asolando, Prologue*.

"A philosopher's life is spent in discovering that, of the half-dozen truths he knew when a child, such an one is a lie, as the world states in set terms; and then, after a weary lapse of years, and plenty of hard thinking, it becomes a truth again after all, as he happens to newly consider it and view it in different relations with the others; and so he restates it, to the confusion of somebody else in good time."

BROWNING, *A Soul's Tragedy*, Act ii.

LECTURE THE SECOND

In the previous Lecture we arrived at the conclusion that a right understanding of the teaching of the sciences of Astronomy and Geology, as to the origin and constitution of "the heavens and the earth," was incompatible with the idea that in the first chapter of Genesis there was given to mankind an authoritative and verbally inspired revelation of the details of such origin and constitution. Leaving on one side the vast and unexplored, but possibly limited, Universe beyond, we have seen our solar system gradually shaping itself into its present state from the remote era when it existed in the guise of a gaseous and fiery nebula in the depths of space; and we have seen the planet on which we live gradually and continuously evolving from the primary condition of heated gases in which it existed when it first took independent form as a constituent unit in our system, revolving round the central mass which is now the sun, until it became a sphere fitted for the abode of life.

We have now to see what science has to teach us as to the origin of life, and its development and

progress till the day when man first appeared, and commenced that wonderful upward march in the region of mind and spirit, which is as marvellous as the evolution of his material frame from the primordial cell; and which will only culminate when "the tabernacle of God shall be with men," and "God shall be all in all."

Reference was made in the previous Lecture to the labours of Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer, the pioneers of the school of Evolution, which now holds the field in all the scientific thought of our time, and this reminds us that the science of Biology, to which we are now brought, is entirely the child of our own age, and due to the life-work of the two great men just named and their contemporaries, Wallace, who is still living, Huxley and Tyndall; and their crowd of successors, to whom the crowning of the edifice, so far as it has yet reached, must be attributed, and of whom it will suffice to name Cope, Eimer, Weismann, Nägeli, Haeckel, Lankester, and Sir Oliver Lodge. These may be divided into two schools, on the question of the possibility or the reverse of the "inheritance of acquired characters," but on the main doctrine of Evolution they are all agreed.[1]

[1] The real author of the theory of Evolution was Lamarck (1744–1829), who discovered the fundamental truth that the world of organisms as we know it is not the result of a number of specific creations, but of a long and complicated process of evolution from the simple to the complex, from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous,

In former days, above all in the eighteenth century, when the theology of the Deists was in the ascendant, and God was regarded as an autocrat who ruled the Universe He had made from a distance beyond and outside it, or, to use the language of the Freemasons, as the Divine Architect of the Universe, and when Paley's simile of the watchmaker and the watch seemed natural as an illustration of the relationship between God and the Universe, it was equally natural and possible to believe in special acts of creation; to believe, that

and this was a great and lasting service. Darwin's claim to fame rests on his proof that this process is accomplished through the interaction of four factors—variability, heredity, excessive fecundity, and selection. The first is probably the property of every organism. The third allows for the tremendous struggle *within each species* (not, as M. Paul Bourget mistakenly says, "between different species"), by which the weak and unfit are killed off and only those fitted to their environment survive; the fourth is the result of this, viz., that out of the great number of organisms produced only those will survive which are best adapted to the condition of the struggle for existence.

The second, heredity, marks the distinction between the older and newer schools of biologists. Lamarck explained the mechanism of the evolutionary process by the hereditary transmission of mental and bodily modifications resulting from functional use or disuse—on the assumption that somatic characters are capable of being modified by surrounding conditions, and that these modifications are capable of hereditary transmission, but, since his day, the science of embryology has sprung into being, and led to the distinction drawn by Weismann between the germ-plasm, which is continuous and immortal and the vehicle of heredity, and the soma-plasm, which passes away with the individual, and any changes in which are not hereditary or transmissible, which theory now holds the field.

Weismann and his school do not deny the fact of heredity—they call in question *the heredity of acquired characters which are purely somatic in their origin.*

is, that each species of plant and animal was specially created when the time for its appearance had arrived, and, in the same way, that man, both as to his material frame and intellectual and spiritual capacities, was the result of a special and final act of power on the part of the Almighty; and this idea derived its highest sanction from a literal interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis.

But such a view of nature and of the origin and progress of life upon the earth is impossible to us of the twentieth century. Just as the older notions in regard to the place of our earth in the Universe have had to give way to the truer views discovered by Astronomy, and just as the catastrophic Geology of the earlier students down to Sir Chas. Lyell (which found Biblical support in the story of the Deluge), have given way to the Uniformitarian Geology of the present day, so is it with the story of life upon the earth.

An interesting and suggestive illustration may be found in the present views on the subject of the progress, or evolution, of Architecture. In the early years of the last century it was possible to regard each period of Architecture as standing by itself, an isolated product of the country or period to which it belonged; and Rickman, for example, did a good work when he classified the various periods of Gothic Architecture in England into their obvious

periods as Norman, Early English, Decorated, and Perpendicular, each, as it were, out of relation to the others. Further study, however, showed that transition periods lay between each, and that, in fact, it was impossible to make a hard and fast dividing line, or to fix any date when one ended and the next began; and now Mr. F. Bond has developed this very idea in his great work on *Gothic Architecture in England*, and shown the organic unity and orderly development of Architecture as a whole according to the laws, if we may say so, of heredity and environment.[1]

Heredity and environment! These two in their mutual play and interaction have been, and are, the controlling factors in the shaping of the wonderful world of life and action of which we form part. Everything that lives brings with it into the world qualities derived from its ancestors, and is, in its turn, acted upon and modified by the conditions in which it finds itself placed. This is as true of the monad as of man, and *vice versâ*.

[1] We may take as an illustration, both interesting and instructive, the magnificent Abbey of Selby, which was so unfortunately destroyed by fire in the year 1906. Founded by William the Conqueror, it contained within its walls examples of every style of Architecture from the Norman to the Decorated, with the transitional periods between each. It was a living growth, not a mechanical composition, and its evolution was guided by the directing mind of its builders. It may be briefly stated thus: Founded 1069; East Nave, 1097–1123; Central Nave, 1123–1175; West Nave, 1175–1190; parts of Upper Nave and West Front, 1190–1220; Choir, Aisle, and Sacristy, 1280–1300; Choir completed in the 2nd quarter of the fourteenth century.

This brings us to the question of the origin of life and its modifications.

"What is "life" and whence comes it? The old answer was simple enough, but it was connected with ideas in respect of God and His methods of working with which it is impossible now to agree. "Life," it was said, was due to the presence in certain forms of matter of a mysterious entity, known as "vital force" or "the vital principle," and all things that live were brought into existence under their different genera and species, which were successively and severally created, fixed and unchangeable, by the fiat of God.

How different, and, I venture to say, how far more worthy is the idea which is given of God's method of working by the theory of Evolution as interpreted by the most reverent and cautious science of the day!

It is true that Haeckel, in his enthusiasm for the system he favours, to which he has given the high-sounding name of "Monism" (and of which he appears to fancy himself the creator, forgetting that it is really quite old, older than Plato and Parmenides), does away with any rational notion of God, as well as with the freedom of the will and immortality, in his interpretation of the theory of Evolution. But Haeckel, as Sir Oliver Lodge has well said, "although a splendid scientist is a poor philosopher," and "the progress of thought has left him, as well as his great English exemplar, Herbert

Spencer, somewhat high and dry, belated and stranded by the tide of opinion which has now begun to flow in another direction. He is, as it were, a surviving voice from the middle of the nineteenth century; he represents opinions which were then prevalent among many leaders of thought—opinions which they themselves in many cases, and their successors still more, lived to outgrow; so that by this time Professor Haeckel's voice is as the voice of one crying in the wilderness, not as the pioneer or vanguard of an advancing army." Thus much it was necessary to say in reference to Professor Haeckel, for his books have been sown broadcast; and, to quote Sir Oliver Lodge again, "so far as Professor Haeckel's writings are read by the thoroughly educated and well-informed, they can do nothing but good. . . . So far as they are read by unbalanced and uncultured persons, with no sense of proportion and but little critical faculty, they may do harm, unless accompanied by an antidote against the bigotry of their somewhat hasty and scornful destructive portions." [1]

The truth is that all philosophy aims at being monistic; it is bound to aim at unification, however difficult of attainment, and the philosopher who abandoned the quest and contented himself with a permanent antinomy—a Universe composed of two or more irreconcilable and antagonistic agencies—

[1] Lodge, *Life and Matter*, pp. 58, 59, and 5, 6.

would be held to be throwing up his brief as a philosopher, and taking refuge in a kind of permanent Manichæism, which experience has shown to be an untenable and ultimately unthinkable position. An attempt at Monism is therefore common to all philosophers, and the only question is what sort of Monism are you aiming at?

There is the Pantheistic Monism of Herbert Spencer and Spinoza; the Idealistic Monism of Bishop Berkeley and Hegel, down to William James; there is the Materialistic Monism of Tyndall; and here we find Haeckel, whose Universe hangs upon a law which he calls the Law of Substance, and who looks upon life as a mere mechanical product.[1] Finally, there is the Christian Monism, as it is summed up by St. Paul in Eph. i. 10.

In justice to Herbert Spencer, it must, however, be here remarked that he never formulated a definite materialistic philosophy. He always left room for the presence and working of the Power whom he called "the Unknowable," which Power, as Dr. Saleeby has shown with great ingenuity in his book, *Evolution the Master-key*, may be argued, though Unknowable, apart altogether from revelation, to be "One, Eternal and Uncreated, the infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed, that wells up in ourselves in the form of consciousness."[2]

[1] Lodge, *Life and Matter*, pp. 7–10.
[2] Saleeby, *op. cit.*, p. 353.

But this carries us a little further than we have yet reached. We must go back and discover the answer science gives to our questions as to *life*. There was an old saying, "Omne vivum ex ovo," which was made much use of in the controversy as to "spontaneous generation" some years ago, and, so far as it goes, it is true; for "all life originates in the cell"; but what is the "cell," and whence does it possess what we call "life"? Let us first see in what "life" consists.

"Life," said Herbert Spencer, "is the sum of the forces which oppose death"; or, again, "the continuous adjustment of external relations to internal relations"; but this does not carry us much further: it is nothing more than a veiling of the mystery by words which practically mean nothing.

Among biologists, the late Lord Kelvin and Sir Oliver Lodge stand alone in predicating the necessity of any such mysterious entity as "vital force" or "vitality." The latter states: "*Life* is itself a guiding principle, a controlling agency; *i.e.*, a live animal or plant can and does guide and influence the elements of inorganic nature, . . . hence, whatever life is or is not, it is certainly this: it is a guiding and controlling entity which interacts with our world according to laws so partially known that we have to say they are practically unknown, and therefore appear in some

respects mysterious."[1] Lord Kelvin stated at Cambridge in 1903, that "modern biologists are coming once more to a firm acceptance of something—and that is 'a vital principle.'"

But we must remember that this "entity" or "vital principle" is always and only found associated with certain special forms and combinations of matter, and thus the answer which Professor Ray Lankester, the foremost exponent in our country of biological science, makes to Lord Kelvin and Sir Oliver Lodge must be admitted to hold the field.

The Professor states: "I will not venture to doubt that Lord Kelvin has such persons amongst his acquaintance. On the other hand, I feel some confidence in stating that a more extensive acquaintance with modern biologists would have led Lord Kelvin to perceive that those whom he cites are but a trifling percentage of the whole. I do not myself know of anyone of admitted leadership among modern biologists who is showing signs of 'coming to a belief in the existence of a vital principle.'

"We biologists take no stock in these mysterious entities. We think it a more helpful method to be patient and to seek by observation of, and experiment with, the phenomena of growth and development to trace the evolution of life and

[1] Lodge, *Life and Matter*, p. 134.

of living things without the facile and sterile hypothesis of 'a vital principle.'"[1]

We shall refer to Professor Ray Lankester's application of this point of view to "Man" in our next Lecture.

As a matter of fact, we must confess with Dr. Bastian that "all things having qualities," *i.e.* everything in the Universe, has "life" of its own; but these are reckoned to be "living" or "not living" according as they possess or do not possess a small group of qualities. These are: (1) apparently spontaneous or instinctive movement, (2) assimilation, and digestion followed by assimilation, (3) fission, due to the unstable equilibrium of the molecule; hence arises the power of reproduction. All things possessing these qualities are reckoned "alive," and all "life" begins in a cell. This cell in which "life" is found must of course be of a certain constant and uniform constitution, though capable of infinite modifications; and such is the case. The particular combination of elements which make up the living cell consist of carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, together with a little sulphur and phosphorus, and is known as "protoplasm," which Huxley rightly called "the physical basis of life." This "protoplasm" belongs to "the class of albumenoids, the nitrogenous car-

[1] Prof. Ray Lankester, *The Kingdom of Man*, pp. 64, 65.

bonates that are distinguished for the extraordinary size of their molecules, and the unstable arrangement of the numerous atoms (more than a thousand) that compose them." Hence it is that living matter is intrinsically mutable: this, says Dr. Bastian, is "the fundamental property of protoplasm."[1]

This being so, we can see at once how natural selection acting with heredity and environment and leading continuously to the modifications which tend to "the survival," in every case, "of the fittest" for the position they have to occupy, has led to the infinite variety of living things which we see around us to-day.

In the earlier of the rocks there are no traces of life. Life springs full-fledged, as it were, in the later rocks, and fishes, a very highly organised form of life, appear in the Silurian. Whence comes it that all the forms of life leading up to this highly developed organism have disappeared? Many naturalists and geologists have tried to answer the question since Darwin, but none satisfactorily. A very valuable and suggestive examination of the various theories has lately been put forward by Dr. A. L. Lane, and we will begin at the wrong end of his speculations by stating the surroundings of early life on the earth as he believes they may have been. Life began in the ocean, and the early forms of life were of

[1] Bastian, *Nature and Origin of Living Matter*, pp. 10, 21, 137.

the nature of jelly fish or simple organisms which were permeated by the fluid in which they dwelt. The salt ocean was in fact their body fluid. It was a warmer ocean then than it is now, and there is some reason for placing its temperature at something above 100 degrees Fahrenheit. It may have been nearly double that. It was also an ocean which had much less lime and deposit in it than now. But as the ages went on the lime and other deposits were brought down from the land in increasing quantities, and the water became more and more hard. Conditions began to change, and the animals in the sea began to change in form too. Up to that time they had been jelly-like, formless, open. Some of them, as a physiological reaction to the increasing "hardness" of the vital medium in which they lived, began to secrete hard parts (as cells on the human skin sometimes secrete horny matter), and consequently animals with shells began to make their appearance. Other soft-bodied animals closed themselves up for a similar reason. Thus there now began to exist animals whose dead bodies left some traces of their tenants, whereas all trace of the boneless, shell-less animals disappeared as soon as they died. Other animals migrated by way of the sandbanks and the shoals to land in search of better conditions. When once shells and skins were started, their great advantages

soon made themselves felt, and evolution retained them.

A minor question is the temperature of the ocean in those early days of boneless, unformed animals, all traces of whose existence have disappeared. It has been suggested by the French physiologist, R. Quinton, that it was about 111 degrees Fahrenheit, which is the highest temperature of the body fluid of existing birds. Quinton suggests this for the reason that just in the same way that in the bodies of the higher animals, such as man, there are traces of a fish-like ancestor, so the body fluid, the blood serum, is the relic of the fluid in which that fish-like animal in its lowest stage of development was bathed. Quinton regards the higher animals as compound colonies of individual cells. The cells are, firstly, those which are made up of living matter or protoplasm; secondly, those of secreted dead matter, such as bone or muscle or shell; thirdly, of various secretions, such as milk; and fourthly, the vital fluid, the saline blood serum, in which the other cells live. This vital fluid bathes all the other living cells, and is the universal circulating fluid. Quinton states that this vital fluid, which is but the sea-water in which they live to the lower sea animals, represents the same thing in the osmotically-closed higher animals. He accordingly compares man to a marine aquarium

filled, not, however, with present-day sea-water, but with that of the early ocean. And he therefore imagines the early ocean to have been a warm ocean with a temperature above the blood heat of man and about the blood heat of birds, and with a composition of water tinged chiefly with sodium chloride. There have been changes in the body fluid since it was once merely the ocean water, but the animals have preserved its composition fairly well, because it was best suited to the nutriment and composition of the protoplasm of which they are built.

It is a curious and interesting fact that sea-water is the only fluid in which the corpuscles of the blood of man and other animals can live when removed from their own vital element.

A short sketch may here be given of the way in which Darwin was led to the idea of Natural Selection as a factor—the principal factor it may be, but not the only factor—in the process of Evolution. The clue was given him, as he tells us, by reading Malthus on Population. More of all races of living beings are produced than can come to maturity. Here is evidently the required material for selection. Living forms of all kinds tend to vary slightly from their parents, and these variations do not all stand an equal chance. Any variations that are better adapted to the conditions tend to be preserved. Under

changing conditions some new variation is likely to be better adapted. The "preservation of favoured races in the struggle for existence" may hence be called "Natural Selection." This theory was elaborated with marvellous ingenuity in *The Origin of Species*, and its main conclusions have never been since overthrown, although later workers, such as Cope in America, and Eimer, have considered that the importance of Darwin's principle has been much overestimated, and that more allowance must be made for the secret causes of variation and the directive force of the environment; and in the *Nineteenth Century*, Professor Henslow, from his own observation and experiments, arrives at the conclusion that Darwin's theory has to be corrected. He would substitute the following for Darwin's statement: "adaptation to the conditions of life by means of the direct response of the organisms."

Since Darwin's day the matter has been further complicated by the controversy as to the inheritance of acquired characters, of which mention was made above, and it is important for us to notice this in view of what we shall have to say later in regard to "sin."

Darwin, in 1868, in *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, promulgated the theory of "Pangenesis" to bring together and

explain the fact of heredity. According to this theory, all the cells of the body, during the process of self-division by which they multiply, throw off "gemmules." By aggregations of these the sexual elements are formed. The gemmules themselves multiply by self-division, and every gemmule admits of being developed into a cell. Sir Francis Galton accepts the distinction between body-cells and gemmules, but instead of taking the developed organism he takes the ovum as the starting-point of the theory, and in this way is able completely to transform it. The sum-total of germs or gemmules in the newly fertilised ovum he calls the "stirp." Only the smaller part of this, he supposes, becomes developed into the "personal structure" of the organism. Out of the residue of undeveloped germs or gemmules are formed the sexual elements of the next generation.[1] Besides these theories there have been those of the "idioplasm" of Nägeli, the "catagenesis" of Cope and many others, but none of these meet the facts as does Weismann.

Thus the notion of a germinal residue "continuous," as Weismann puts it, from one generation to another, is substituted for Darwin's notion of an aggregate newly forming from the body-cells in each new organism. In Weismann's theory hereditary transmission of character depends wholly,

[1] Galton, *Journal* of the Anthropological Institute, 1875.

in Galton's it depends mainly, on this undeveloped residue.

Weismann, and in this he was anticipated by Galton in the communication to the *Journal* of the Anthropological Institute referred to above, holds that "acquired characters are not inherited" where they only affect the soma-plasm which perishes from generation to generation, and not the germ-plasm which is continuous and immortal. He says: "New characters in plants and animals are (*a*) blastogenic and transmissible, or (*b*) somatogenic and non-transmissible; *i.e.*, the new characters transmitted to the progeny are only those connected with and due to changes in the 'germ-plasm.'"

Haeckel, on the other hand, maintains that "the history of parasites provides abundance of the most striking proofs of the much-contested inheritance of acquired characters." Dr. Bastian, however, contends that the difference is not so great as might be supposed, and that Weismann is not altogether consistent with himself. He says: "The real difference which divides the two schools is as follows: according to Weismann, changes in the soma cannot lead to or be associated with definite and correlated changes in the germ-plasm; though changes in the germ-plasm are in some inscrutable way, through the intermediation of his countless armies of deter-

minants and biophors, supposed by him to be capable of leading to precise correlated changes in the soma. According to Spencer and others, however, changes in the soma induced by external conditions *may* become associated with definitely related changes in the germ-plasm. Such correlated changes are held by them to be no more" (and, we may add, no less) "impossible or inscrutable than those which we see every day actually occurring in reverse order, viz., the development of animals and plants from their germs, although, in view of the excessively complicated nature of the processes, we are obliged, as Spencer says, to admit that the actual organising process transcends conception. Thus, in the opinion of Weismann, the soma cannot communicate precise changes to the germ-plasm, though the germ-plasm can lead to an exact building up of the soma; while, according to Spencer, the germ-plasm and the soma are mutually capable of influencing each other in specific ways.

"But," he goes on, "Weismann is not consistent, and indeed frankly admits the whole point in dispute, viz., that *acquired characters can be and are frequently inherited.* He says, for example, 'It is indubitable that external influences, such as those emanating from the environment or media in which the species live, are able to cause direct variation in the germ-plasm, *i.e.*, permanent, because hereditary,

variations,' and this he calls 'induced germinal selection.' Again, he speaks of the germ-plasm as 'ready and able to furnish any variation possible in a species, if that is required by external circumstances.'"[1]

But what Weismann has really proved, and that which constitutes the permanent advance in biological science associated with his name, is *the non-hereditability of acquired characters acting wholly on the soma-plasm*; and the theory, of which he is the author, viz., that the germ-plasm is that substance by means of which alone the capacity for development and reproduction possessed by an organism is handed on to the offspring,—that it is the hereditary substance, the vehicle for hereditary transmission, the substance by means of which the continuity of life is secured,—is the one which is most in harmony with the facts, the one which seems most likely to survive, not without modification, perhaps, but in all its fundamental ideas. It is, as a recent writer expresses it, "a brilliant construction, consistently thought out, and cleverly adjusted to the facts of which it affords a logical explanation," and thus it is "a monumental work, bearing the impress of an original and powerful intellect."[2]

[1] Weismann, *Evolution Theory*, vol. ii. pp. 196, 267; Bastian, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

[2] Chatterton-Hill, *Heredity and Selection in Sociology*, p. 26; and see pp. 65 *seq.*

Dr. Bastian's researches have further shown it to be possible, if not probable, that the mystery of the origin of life is not merely a mystery of the far distant past, but that it is a continuous one, and one that is taking place, in all probability, down to the present time. Thus, in his opinion, spontaneous generation, as it may be called, is continuously and continually taking place; *i.e.*, wherever the necessary combination of the four elements, carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen, together with a little sulphur and phosphorus, is found in suitable circumstances, there is protoplasm; and, again given favouring circumstances, where there is protoplasm, there is life. Hence new life, he holds, may be *ever* appearing, and indeed the mystery should be relatively less, and the "miracle" less wonderful now when the world is full of protoplasmic materials derived from previously existing living forms than it was when life first appeared upon the earth. This conclusion agrees admirably with the opinions of physicists as to the age of the earth. Whereas Haeckel demands "hundreds of millions of years" as the period during which life must have been developing on the earth, and fixes on 100,000,000 years as the term since which invertebrates first appeared, and Darwin spoke of "Natural Selection only acting by very short and slow steps," while Prof. Darwin, at the South Africa Meeting of the British Association, in 1905, said, "It

does not seem extravagant to suppose that 500 to 1000 million years may have elapsed since the birth of the moon," it is well known that physicists have been only willing to allow a much shorter period for the whole existence of the earth as a separate member of the solar system. Lord Kelvin will only allow from 20 to 40 million years for this, and prefers the limit of "nearer 20" than 40; Joly prefers 90 million years, but, even so, is a long way from the demands of the extreme biologists, while Professor Sollas prefers "about 30,000,000." Hence the gulf between these two opposing sets of opinions seemed to be impassable, but Dr. Bastian has provided a bridge. He says: "Instead of believing with Darwin that 'all the living forms of life are the lineal descendants of those that lived before the Cambrian epoch,' and that 'all the organic beings which have ever lived upon the earth may be descended from some one primordial form,' we must admit that life originally started from multitudes of centres; that from the earliest stages of the earth's history up to the present, new starting-points of simplest form have been ever taking place all over the surface of the earth. Thus the facts concerning 'persistent types' may be explained, and also how the time needed for the whole evolution of life on the globe may not have been so long as has been supposed. The routes may have been many, contemporary, and

simultaneous, and thus multitudes of facts can be explained, many of them absolutely irreconcilable with the old point of view. This theory assumes that 'the forms of nature and material properties have ever remained the same, and that new births of living matter have ever been taking place.' Thus," Dr. Bastian concludes, and I quote this, because it provides an "antidote" to Haeckel, and falls in with the point I wish to make, "there are good reasons for the conviction that the same Forces which are now in action within and around us have been and are constantly operative throughout the whole Universe, everywhere producing the most uniform and complex results, which combine in testifying to the existence of one supreme and all-pervading Power of which these results are the phenomenal manifestation." It is refreshing to listen to words like these from the mouth of one of our foremost men of science; and such words and similar ones from Sir Oliver Lodge form a sufficient answer to all who would say that "Science is committed to Haeckel's materialistic Monism." It is not so. "One supreme and all-pervading Power!" Who is this but the transcendent and immanent God of the latest philosophical speculation? Transcendent above the Universe in a better and nobler sense than ever the Deists or those who hold by traditional views of the Old Testament can conceive, and yet immanent in the Universe

He has called into being; pervading all space, animating every living cell, and all the multitudinous combinations of complex organisations of which those cells, in His hands, have proved themselves capable; Himself one with and yet distinct from all things that are—the soul of the Universe.

Even Monists are not always consistent with themselves, however, in their materialism, and often attribute personal qualities, for example, to Natural Selection, which imply either that this abstract property is itself "God," or guided by "God." *E.g.*, Weismann more than once speaks of Selection in terms of personality, as, for instance, when speaking of variations in the germ-plasm and the soma, he says, "Selection continually *keeps watch* over both kinds of variations"; and again, "Selection eliminates all that lessens the purity of the specific type." And even Haeckel moves far on the road towards Spinozism and Pantheism, though he repudiates any transcendent and supreme God, when, in his *Last Words on Evolution*, he writes thus of his practically deified "Matter": "Our Monistic God, the all-embracing essence of the world, *the Nature-God of Spinoza and Goethe*, is identical with the eternal, all-inspiring energy, and is one, in eternal and infinite substance, with space-filling matter. It 'lives and moves in all things,' *as the Gospel says*. And we find God in natural

law itself. The will of God is at work in every falling drop of rain and every growing crystal, in the scent of the rose and the spirit of man."

May we not say of one who can write like this, that, in spite of his occasional scoffs and lapses into bad taste, he is not far from the kingdom of God?

Thus the Christian who is at the same time open to the teaching of the best modern science can say, in a deeper sense than the old Hebrew priestly writer understood, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"; and at the same time a further meaning is given to the words of the Christ, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

Can we proceed to find a deeper and truer meaning in the further statement in Gen. i.: "In the image of God created He man"?

We have seen that all life originates in the cell, and that from the variations produced by heredity and environment and the growing complexity of organised beings in the process of evolution, all the varieties of plants and animals, including man himself, have been derived. If the original life-centres were innumerable, and if new life is ever being produced, this is only to say that while we can no longer affirm that *all* things now living on the earth are derived from one primordial cell, yet the line that culminates in man may be clearly traced from one or more primordial cells.

In this respect, as Biology is more and more unmistakably showing, phylogeny and ontogeny are one; every living thing passes, perceptibly or imperceptibly, through every preceding stage in the scale of being up to the point that its parents have reached, and by the slow process of variation induced by heredity and environment and aided by selection, prepares the way for further advance. Thus the babe, ere it is born into the world, as it grows day by day from the microscopic cell in which its potentialities lie wrapped up in the moment of conception, epitomises within itself all the stages of the evolution of the human race from the first primordial cell which was to develop into man, and brings with it ancestral memories and hereditary tendencies which will, in their turn, be modified by the environment in which it finds itself placed on its entrance into being.[1] Whence then comes the soul and the mind of man? It was all there in potentiality from the beginning. It is impossible to say where consciousness begins; for just as life is inherent in certain forms of matter, so consciousness is inherent in life, and the brain of a Goethe and a Shakespeare was potentially present in the first primordial cell from which the human race is derived. This, however, is only to say that God was working with that end in view throughout the ages, and it is still true that "God breathed

[1] See Note A, p. 79.

into man's nostrils the breath of life," understanding by this that God endowed the primordial cell, which after its age-long progress was to culminate in man, with all the possibilities of mind and soul which make man what he is,—"the paragon of animals." All "life" is so far conscious. Haeckel speaks of the "memory" of the "radiolaria"; but in the growing complexity of the cells which compose the brain, and in the development in this way of the organ of mind, we find the secret of ever-increasing consciousness. It is the mind of God working in and through the variation and evolution of the brain-cells until the being who shall become a reasoning man is produced, and thus in a deep and true sense "man is the image of God."

Mind, therefore, is not a property of living matter, though associated wholly with certain special organs as the being becomes more differentiated and complex; but it is potentially present in all living matter, inherent in the cell ere differentiation takes place, and the force that is behind and guiding all the processes of evolution till we arrive at the consciousness and free-will of man is the will and purpose of God.

Keeping this in view, we may agree with Weismann when he says: "Even although we assume that we might succeed in understanding the mere chemistry of life, . . . the so-called 'animal'

functions of the living substance would remain uncomprehended—Sensation, Will, Thought. We can understand, in some sense, how the liver secretes bile; also, given a sensitiveness to stimulus of living substance, how a sense impression may be conveyed to the nerves by the brain, but how the activity of certain brain elements can give rise to a thought *which cannot be compared with anything material*, which is nevertheless able to react on the material parts of our body, and, as Will, to give rise to movement—that we attempt in vain to understand. Of course the dependence of thinking and willing on a material substratum is clear enough, and it can be demonstrated with certainty in many directions, and thus materialism is so far justified in drawing parellels between brain and thought on the one hand, and liver and bile on the other, but this is by no means to say that we have understood *how* will and thought have come to be. In recent times it has been pointed out that the physical functions of the body increase very gradually with the successive stages of the organisation, and from the lowest beginnings ascend slowly to the intelligence of man in exact correspondence with the height of the organisation reached by the species. This, however, does not mean that we have understood Spirit. Man has evolved from animal ancestors, whose nearest relatives were the Anthropoid Apes. Hence the factors which brought

about the development of man from his Simian ancestry must be the same as those which have brought about the whole of evolution: change of external influences in its direct and indirect effects (environment), tendencies to germinal variation (heredity) acted upon by Selection, which only gives rise to what is suited to its end; beyond that it can call forth nothing.

"Must this," Weismann continues, "be true of the human mind? Can it only be developed as far as its development is of advantage to man's power of survival? Certainly in a general way, but certain individuals may from time to time be more highly endowed"; and, as a proof of this, we notice the undoubted fact that "geniuses never raise the average mental capacity of the race."[1] From time to time they appear, but they transmit none of their high mental qualities to their descendants, as may be seen, for example, in the cases of Mohammed, Oliver Cromwell, Shakespeare, Goethe, to mention only one or two outstanding instances.

As regards man's physical frame, then, his descent from animal ancestors is an absolutely ascertained fact of biological science; and as regards his mental and spiritual capacities, these are due to the special development of his brain, the organ *par excellence* of mind, under the guiding hand of "Selection" acting through heredity and environ-

[1] Weismann, *op. cit.*, vol. ii. pp. 392 *seq.*

ment—*i.e.*, as we Christians reverently believe, under the guiding hand of God.[1]

I have dwelt at perhaps too great a length on Dr. Bastian's theory as to the possibility of the production of new life in its primal form of protoplasm at all stages of the earth's history, from the first dawn of life upon the globe down to the present time, for, notwithstanding his own researches and Mr. Burke's discovery of "Radiobes," the problem is by no means settled as yet, and Dr. Bastian's theory is not popular, but I have done so both because of the reverence of its author, and because it does provide a bridge, if necessary, between the physicist on the one hand and the astronomers and geologists and biologists on the other.

But the discovery of radium has put the matter on a different footing, and perhaps made this bridge unnecessary. The property of radium is, as is now well known, to diffuse heat without the slightest appreciable loss, while at the same time the emanations from radium transmute themselves into helium. Only the merest fragment of radium has been, so far, isolated, but it is now held that this element is everywhere present in the constituents of which the solar system is composed, and that, owing to its property of diffusing and maintaining heat without losing substance, all the time required

[1] See Note B, p. 83.

by astronomers and geologists and biologists as against the physicists may now be granted them.

Thus Professor Ray Lankester, at the York Meeting of the British Association, in 1906, spoke as follows: [1]—

"Radium has been proved to give out enough heat to melt rather more than its own weight of ice every hour; enough heat in one hour to raise its own weight of water from the freezing-point to the boiling-point. After a year and six weeks a gram of radium has emitted enough heat to raise the temperature of a thousand kilograms of water one degree. And this is always going on. Even a small quantity of radium diffused through the earth will suffice to keep up its temperature against all loss by radiation! If the sun consists of a fraction of one per cent. of radium, this will account for and make good the heat that is annually lost by it.

"This is a tremendous fact, upsetting all the calculations of physicists as to the duration in past and future of the sun's heat and the temperature of the earth's surface. The geologists and the biologists have long contended that some thousand million years must have passed during which the earth's surface has presented approximately the same conditions of temperature as at present, in order to allow time for the evolution of living things and the formation

[1] The Lecture from which this passage is quoted has since been published in *The Kingdom of Man*, pp. 66–158.

of the aqueous deposits of the earth's crust. The physicists, notably Professor Tait and Lord Kelvin, refused to allow more than ten million years (which they subsequently increased to a hundred million)—basing this estimate on the rate of cooling of a sphere of the size and composition of the earth. They have assumed that its material is self-cooling. But, as Huxley pointed out, mathematics will not give a true result when applied to erroneous data. It has now, within these last five years, become evident that the earth's material is not self-cooling, but, on the contrary, self-heating. And away go the restrictions imposed by physicists on geological time. They now are willing to give us not merely a thousand million years, but as many more as we want."

To this testimony we may add that of Sir Robert Ball, late Astronomer-Royal of Ireland, whose name is well known in the University of Dublin. In a lecture at the Bishopsgate Institute in October 1906, he stated that the "problem had now been set at rest."[1]

[1] Sir Robert Ball, in an address delivered at the Bishopsgate Institute, said that the discovery of radium had gone a long way to solve an important controversy between mathematicians and geologists as to the peopling of the earth. Lord Kelvin, basing his figures on our present knowledge of the internal heat of the earth and of the condition of the cooled rocks of the earth's crust, had calculated that not more than twenty million years ago the earth's surface was so hot that water would not rest on it; the oceans were vapour. Twenty million years, therefore, was the limit of time

Thus, even supposing that life originated once for all in the Cambrian Epoch, and that all existing life—the whole process of organic evolution—is the outcome of that primal cell endowed with life, sufficient time has now been found for the development to have taken place.

In his most fascinating book on *The Evolution of Matter*, published in 1906, Professor Rutherford has a chapter on "The Origin and Life of Radium," in which he gives a veritably romantic account of this wonderful element. This extraordinary substance is indisputably an element, and yet it compels us completely to modify our conception of an element. The atom of radium, we now know, is an evolutionary product of the still larger and

during which geologists had to "get through their work of peopling the earth with forms of life." The geologists complained that they could not make their discoveries and deductions accord with that "miserable allowance of time." Still, the mathematicians going over their calculations again, would not give them a week longer. In this difficulty, however, radium had come to the aid of the geologists. The Hon. Mr. Strutt, son of Lord Rayleigh, had shown that in the rocks in the crust of the earth there was a considerable quantity of radium, which was for ever pouring out heat at a great rate. This being the case, the date at which the earth first became cool enough for life must have been far more remote than twenty million years ago. It must have been so far remote as to give the geologists the eight hundred million years that they wanted to account for the phenomena they had found. The discrepancy to which he had alluded had long been a problem in science, but he believed the controversy had now been set at rest. Mr. Strutt had shown that a very small quantity of radium would go a very long way to explain the heat that we found as we bored into the earth. All the radium that had yet been got would not fill a lady's thimble. (Report of Sir R. Ball's address in the *Morning Post*. But see Note C, p. 85.)

more complicated atom of uranium, and furthermore it has a life-history of its own. It is born, it lives, it dies. Nothing is lost, but all is changed; and it is now practically certain that in due course the atom of radium, which can be found to "grow" in solutions of uranium, is transformed into an atom of lead and five atoms of helium. All this is discussed in abundant detail by Professor Rutherford.

We have now accorded an all too rapid survey to the sciences of Astronomy, Geology, and Biology as they affect our special subject, and we have arrived at the point when man, the last and highest creature in the scale of organised being, because he is the only creature *who is conscious of himself*, the only one who, as he gazes out upon the Universe, can say, "I am I," "Cogito, ergo sum," stands upon the earth, and we have seen that any *literal* interpretation of the first two chapters of Genesis are entirely inconsistent with, and incompatible with, the facts of science as they are known in this twentieth century.

In the next Lecture we proceed to inquire into the length of time which may reasonably be supposed to have elapsed since the foot of man first trod the earth, and into the mental and physical condition of the earliest and succeeding generations of the human race till we arrive at the confines of History.

Here, then, we enter the domain of Prehistoric Archæology, to which the long march of evolution from the primordial cell to man has slowly but surely brought us, for "Archæology begins where Geology ends," and henceforth "the highest study of mankind," as Pope says, will be our theme. We have traversed a large tract of country, and surveyed the scene from the dawn of life upon our globe until man appears, and we have seen, through all the wondrous transformations and changes, the overruling and guiding hand of God, and on the whole the story has been one of advance, of progress, throughout. Haeckel's *Monism* has been tried and found wanting, for it is only old Materialism writ large, and it deals wholly with effects, not causes; it explains the processes of Nature's working, and leaves out of sight the great Cause of all. To use the illustration from a tramcar, of which the Professor, or his *fidus Achates* Mr. Jos. McCabe, is very fond, it sees that, like the car, Nature moves along certain fixed lines, but it forgets that those lines were *pre-ordained*, and that, just as the car, unguided, will overleap the lines, and rush downhill to destruction, so Nature requires the constant care and guidance of the Divine Being, who in His infinite and eternal Essence transcends Nature, and called her into existence, and who is the Fount and Origin of all her processes, the informing and immanent

Spirit; who, as transcendent, forms with the material Universe a dualism from which it is impossible to escape; and who, as immanent, sums up in Himself the true Monism after which Haeckel vainly strives.[1]

The Universe in which we live is a Universe of Divinely ordained and perpetual change, and these changes are for the most part in the direction of constant advance and progress, notwithstanding back-currents and eddies which may be observed even in Nature herself, but are more especially noticeable in the case of man, in whom we have to deal with a being who is conscious, in spite of all the dogmas of determinism, of a power of choice, and choice implies free-will, and free-will implies a possibility of choice for the worse and not for the better. In succeeding Lectures we shall endeavour to discuss the problem as to how man chose, and how God has overruled man's choice for the furtherance of His own eternal and unchanging purpose.[2]

[1] See Note D, p. 86.

[2] The final word on the whole theological opposition was said by Darwin, referring in a letter to a sermon by Dr. Pusey against Evolution (1878):—

"Dr. Pusey's attack will be as powerless to retard by a day the belief in evolution, as were the virulent attacks made by divines fifty years ago against geology, and the still older one of the Catholic Church against Galileo; for the public is wise enough always to follow scientific men when they agree upon any subject, and now there is almost complete unanimity among scientific men about

NOTE A, p. 68.

In his recent book, *The Scientific Temper in Religion*, Father Waggett very ably attacks the purely materialistic theory of Evolution—though at the present day no evolutionist, certainly not Nägeli or Cope or Eimer, nor Weismann in reality, and not even Haeckel himself, would own to being pure materialists, as we have seen—by impaling the holders of such a theory upon the horns of a dilemma, which, however, does not state the case altogether fairly. He argues thus:—

"If there existed, as no naturalist will say there does exist, a thinker so acute and so successful that he had traced his path all the way by secure steps down from the varied scene of mammalian existence to the formless but still living reality of the cell-like protozoon, he would not really have reduced the gulf to an easy leaping-space between non-life and lowest life, for he carries along with him in his very knowledge of the characteristics of protoplasm, all the facts that go to the full description of the entire varied scene of organic life . . . his last term is shown to contain, in Tyndall's phrase, 'the promise and the potency of all the rest.'"

This is true up to the extent of our, at present,

evolution, though there is still cnosiderable difference as to the means."

The same thing, *mutatis mutandis*, may be said as to the present position of the historical criticism of the Old Testament.

actually ascertained knowledge; but if Dr. Bastian's deductions or Mr. Burke's experiments should ever succeed in proving the possibility of effecting the transition from non-life to life in the laboratory, the "leaping-space" itself will have been abolished, and we shall have a further demonstration of that which all experience points to, viz., that there are no gaps in Nature.

Father Waggett continues:—"With regard to this humblest form . . . we are in a dilemma, shutting us up on either hand to a hopeful conclusion. Grant first—and it is a bold concession—that the relation between the lowest protozoon and the mammal is a relation of time; that the one represents an *earlier* form than the other; that there has been, in short, a succession of forms on the earth, a succession such that the earlier linger on with the later arrivals. Grant further that the succession is wholly one of descent; that the various forms are related to one another in kinship. Then follows our dilemma. Either the progressive differentiation of the later, younger, more complicated forms has been wholly due to the original quality of the protozoon (of course under the various stimulations and opportunities of the environment), or it has not. If it has not, then additional forces of life, forces of vigour, and forces to shape and qualify have been introduced into the series of descent from outside. From whence? . . . To suppose them is to say that . . . the primitive form is not in any true sense an ancestor, but only the leading member of a file; that in

reaching that simplest form we have not at all narrowed the description or lessened the wonder of life.

"What is the other horn of the dilemma? If the descent has been indeed a descent, if no forces have been at work except such as were present in the earliest form, and required only the environment for their development, then mark what follows. It follows that instead of taking the undifferentiated jelly as explanation of the flocks and herds, of man with his society and the creations of his art, we have to take these as the explanation, as the large and manifested description, of the hidden potencies of the jelly. . . . Your stately civilisation, your art, your prayer, says the Naturalist-Agnostic, these are no spiritual creation. They are but the last result of nervous reflexes which exist in essence in the simplest monad. Your life is nothing greater than a speck of jelly *opened out.* And we reply: Your jelly is nothing less than human society *folded up.*"

And then Father Waggett goes on to show, on the authority of Mendel, that "the Selection theory does not even propose to account for one special feature of living substance, viz., its tendency to variation."

Of course it does not—the province of the naturalist is to note and record facts, not to offer explanations.

To return to Father Waggett's dilemma. The materialist would not admit that he was tied down to either of its horns, and for the theistic argument

it is unnecessary. The answer of the materialist would be that nothing in the process of evolution has been introduced from outside except what is due to assimilation from the environment, but that all that is to be the future outcome of the process is implicitly present from the first. He goes no further, but he does not deny what the Theist asserts, viz., that the process is due to, and is evidence of, a guiding and informing purpose and will. He only says, "Nature, of herself, does not either assert or deny this."

The Theist does not assert that the process is brought about by the introduction of qualities from outside on the part of God as transcendent, as the first horn of the dilemma postulates, but he does maintain that all that is to be is present implicitly from the first, and is guided and brought to its ultimate issue by the presence and through the purpose and will of God, as immanent, working in and with every detail of the age-long process.

An illustration may be found in embryology. The physiologist can detect no difference in the speck of jelly which is to issue in the dog, for example, and the man, and, up to a certain stage, the course run is precisely similar. A dog at six weeks from conception is undistinguishable from the human being at eight weeks. The process continues: nothing is introduced from outside, but the embryo is developed and nourished by its environment—it is in the mother and the mother in it, and in due course, in the one case a puppy is born, and in the other an infant.

Thus is God immanent in all the processes of nature, while transcending and guiding all in accordance with His purpose.

NOTE B, p. 72.

Mr. Headley thus summarises the results of a comparative study of the "Minds of Men and Animals" from the point of view of the thorough-going evolutionist. "Starting with the simplest forms of animal life," he says, "I have shown reason to believe that even the Amœba and the Infusorians have some rudiment of intelligence. . . . Higher in the scale we are able to divide actions into three classes—reflex, instinctive, intelligent. . . . In man we find what appears an immeasurable advance beyond the high-water mark of other animals. Instead of instincts, he has instinctive impulses that set him at work to learn. He has a wonderful power of attention, so that he can devote all the energy of his complex brain to one subject. . . . We stand at the top of the pile and try (or do not try) to add something to it, so that our successors may begin at a slightly higher level than ourselves. Language and writing have made possible for the human brain its greatest achievements. . . . Yet it would seem that the long course of evolution has added no absolutely new power. In the lowest organisms we have protoplasm with little of specialisation, with nothing of complication. In the human brain we find specialisation and complication carried to the highest point. . . . Beyond a

doubt it is the most wonderful thing in nature. In itself, and in its achievements, it is so wonderful that it is difficult to believe in its humble origin. Still the raw material for this most glorious of structures is to be found in the one-celled micro-organisms. . . . With all his brain-power man is akin to the micro-organisms.

"Here is a very definite verdict, but one that will convey widely different meanings to different people. Some will think of the micro-organisms as sharing the greatness of man. Others will see in it rather the degradation of man than the ennobling of the lower ranks. Fresh from laboratory experiments, they will say that man, like the unicellular organisms, gives to every stimulus from without an inevitable response. His environment plays upon him as a musician plays upon an instrument. . . . When Cranmer held his right hand in the flame, he was only doing, they would say, what he could not help doing, being what he was, just as the heliotropic Euglena cannot help moving towards the light. . . . If an Infusorian is but an instrument, man must be set down equally as an instrument that is played upon, though a very splendid one. But though the laboratory men abolish will (indeed, quite apart from them and their experiments free-will *in the old sense* is unthinkable), yet there remains something as yet unexplained. There is the wave of consciousness that never ceases its onward movement. What is ethereal, incorporeal, seems to affect the body. Mind seems to influence matter. . . . Here then is something that, so far,

has not yielded to the attacks of the materialist. To be honest, however, it is difficult to see how the explanation, whatever it may be, can give us free-will. We should remain automatic. Yet one cannot help cherishing some poor shred of hope that we may be free in some true sense. And here, too, is a consolatory fact: for practical purposes, what is wanted is not free-will, but a working belief in it. When the time for decision and for action comes, a man must feel that he is free to choose or he is lost. And this working belief in free-will, even though the thing itself be proved to be a phantom and an illusion, is the inalienable property of every healthy man."—HEADLEY, *Life and Evolution*, pp. 212–215.

NOTE C, p. 75.

That Dr. Bastian's theory that "new births of living matter have ever been taking place" may still provide a useful bridge, if the views of the physicists should in the end, after all, prevail, is evident from the fact that Lord Kelvin was, to the last, unconvinced of the possibilities provided by radium.

This will appear from the following letter written by Lord Kelvin to Professor Orr of Glasgow, on the age of the earth, which is believed to be his latest utterance on the subject:—

NETHERHALL, LARGS, *January 29th*, 1906.

DEAR PROFESSOR ORR,—Absence from home last week has prevented me from sooner answering your

letter of January 19th. I do not think there is any serious probability in the suggestion of Professor Darwin and Mr. Whetham, that either the heat of the sun or the underground heat of the earth is practically due in any considerable proportion to radio-active matter. The gravitational theory is amply sufficient to account for the heat of both bodies and of all the stars in the universe, and it seems almost infinitely improbable that radium adds practically to their energy for the emission of heat and light. It may be indeed more probable that the energy of radium may have come originally in connection with the excessively high temperature which we know to have been produced, and to be at present being produced, by gravitational action throughout the universe. You will find a good deal more on the subject of later date than the passage to which you refer in pages 10 to 131, volume 2, of my popular *Lectures and Addresses*, and in *Philosophical Magazine*, 1899, first half-year, page 66, making a strong body of evidence that the age of the earth as an abode fitted for life cannot probably be vastly greater than twenty million years. Most of this evidence would not be seriously affected, even if radium concurred appreciably with gravitation in producing the heat and light which we have at present in the universe.

(Signed) KELVIN.

NOTE D, p. 78.

"So completely has the idea of Evolution, in one or other of its many forms, justified itself as an instrument of inquiry—and no human thought is more than such an instrument—that it has not only been applied to the sacred book, to the history of belief, and the innermost contents of religious faith, but it is already modifying our conception of God. At the present day it is hardly too much

to say that 'Deism' is no longer a living faith. . . . The centre of religious interest has moved. Those who seek God seek for witnesses of Him in the bountiful earth, and the broad sky, and in the widening marvel of human history. Many believe that all that is, and has been, and is yet to come, is not too vast to reveal Him. . . . Evolution has been silently habituating us to the conception that what is, was; and that what will be, is. It has brought the 'End,' the final goal, to the beginning of things, and made all the expanse of the natural creation and the moving panorama of human history its declaration and manifestation of itself. *All is one scheme, and God is the meaning of it.* Thus, almost without knowing it, we have come to adopt the conception of God as immanent. It was implicit all along in the idea of Evolution."

But God is transcendent as well as immanent. In this way only can His perfection and the reality of evil and genuine freedom of choice be vindicated. Thus the writer continues: "Unless any analysis of the religious consciousness is altogether false, it must endeavour somehow to maintain *both* the Immanence and the Transcendence of God. It can yield up neither of the two conceptions, except with its own life. Actual living religion, the religion which is both trust and devotion, requires a God who is very near to man, the life within his life, the truth, the inner essence, the very substance of his being; and yet it demands a God who transcends finite reality, and from the

very fulness of His perfection is known by us only as in a glass, darkly."

The writer goes on to develop his argument from the experience of the self-conscious ego, and concludes: "If we take the products of our own spirits and the nature of our own self-consciousness as our clue, we shall find some hint of the way in which He who lives in all things may transcend all things. Self-consciousness is always its own content and more; for it is the content gathered into a diaphanous unity. The very intimacy of its indwelling in every element of its experience makes it transcend that experience."

Thus, "we can believe in a God who is transcendent *because* He is immanent." — Professor Henry Jones, LL.D., F.B.A., "Divine Immanence," *Hibbert Journal*, July 1907.

The whole article is worthy of study, and bears out the view which the author independently formed and has here endeavoured to enunciate. Compare and contrast "Immanence and Christian Purpose," by Professor A. C. M'Giffert in the same issue of the *Hibbert Journal*.

Compare also the article by Professor G. Henslow on "Directivity"—a word coined by Professor A. H. Church—to express the uniform characteristic of "Life," and which implies the presence "as immanent of an Omnipotent Director," whose attributes are "Consciousness and Will," in the *Hibbert Journal*, October 1907.

LECTURE THE THIRD

GENESIS AND SCIENCE: THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN

"Man is man, whatever he came from."

"Amid the supreme realities of the moral and spiritual world, or in the devotional study of the word of God, it becomes a matter of relative unimportance to a Christian whether he is to trace his pedigree back directly or indirectly to the dust. For it is God's world after all."—AUBREY MOORE, *Science and the Faith*, 212, 214.

"What a piece of work is a man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals! And yet to me what is this quintessence of dust?"—*Hamlet*, Act ii. sc. 2.

LECTURE THE THIRD

THE two previous Lectures have sufficiently demonstrated, if demonstration were needed at the present day, and if one did not feel that in laying stress upon the proof and the facts proved one were repeating and emphasising what the progress of science has made almost a commonplace, that the early chapters of Genesis cannot be "reconciled," in any literal acceptation, with the truths of Astromony, Geology, or Biology. As regards the material Universe, and the earth's place therein, the constitution and progress of the earth from her primal condition to her present state, and the orderly evolution of life upon the globe through all the orders of living things—plants and animals —up to the appearance of man, these chapters cannot any longer be taken as a revelation of the manner and method of Creation.

Just as Astronomy shows us the solar system taking its place among unnumbered similar systems, and the earth taking its place as a member of that system, and just as Geology teaches us the gradual and age-long stages through which the earth

passed in her advance from the condition of a fiery mass until she was capable of supporting life, so Biology teaches us the orderly march and progression of life upon the globe from the primordial cell, through all the ranks of plants and animals, until we arrive at man, that wonderful being who stands erect and looks out upon the face of Nature conscious of himself. Here theology made her last stand. If all other special creations must be abandoned, this at least must be held fast to. Man was made, by some special creative act, "in the image of God," "a little lower than the angels."

But can man thus be left out of the account?

His physical frame is merely a modification, not so great as many previous ones, of pre-existing models, and though no one of the existing tribes of apes may be accounted his ancestor, yet physiology plainly teaches that in the "far backward and abysm of time" man and the apes had a common ancestor. Neither are his mental endowments sufficient to postulate a special creation; for the development of his brain is, as we have seen, only the outcome under the combined influence of heredity and environment of faculties inherent in the cell. Further, the student of Prehistoric Archæology and Anthropology has now opportunities of seeing, as it were, man in the making,

and he beholds him taking his place, in due course, in the orderly scheme of nature.[1]

The search for the "Missing Link" has been abandoned, for, with the knowledge that man diverged from the apes in a far distant past it is no longer necessary, but Professor Dubois discovered in Java a very early type of man, little removed from simian characteristics, in the *Pithecanthropus erectus.* Prehistoric Archæology, however, can show us man, and of a relatively high type, existing in Europe in a very remote past.

Sixty years ago, or thereabouts, it was still easy to picture the human race as commencing its earthly career with our forefather Adam some six thousand years ago, and to imagine "Adam" to have started as a full-grown and absolutely

[1] "There is, it may be said without exaggeration, no school or body of thinkers at the present day, who are acquainted with the fact, now ascertained, which denies the orderly evolution of the Kosmos by the regular operation of a more or less completely ascertained series of properties resident in the material of which it consists. The process of evolution—the interaction of these ascertainable, if not fully ascertained properties—has led (it is held), in the case of the cooling cinder which we call the earth—by an inevitable and predestined course—to the formation of that which we call living matter, and eventually of Man himself. . . . Man is held to be a part of nature, a product of the definite and orderly evolution which is universal; a being resulting from and driven by the one great nexus of mechanism which we call nature. He stands alone, face to face, with that relentless mechanism. It is his destiny to understand and to control it."—Ray Lankester, *Kingdom of Man*, pp. 6, 7; and cf. pp. 8, 9, and 62 *seq.*

innocent being in a blissful Paradise from which he, by transgression, fell. These ideas were largely due to a literal reading of the third chapter of Genesis, and still more to Milton's magnificent poem of *Paradise Lost.* It is not too much to say that the ordinary Englishman's notions of the Creation and Fall of man were almost wholly derived, in many cases perhaps unconsciously, from the ideas embodied in that great work of art, just as the Italian's conceptions of Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven were derived, albeit also unconsciously, from Dante.

But coincidently with the discoveries of Darwin and Wallace, and the accumulating proofs of man's derivation from an animal ancestry through Evolution acting by Natural Selection on heredity and environment, evidences of the antiquity of the human race began to be discovered, first in what may be compared with a trickling stream, then in an ever widening and deepening flood, which could no longer be withstood. It is true that as far back as the end of the seventeenth century, a magnificent specimen of a Palæolithic celt (now in the British Museum),[1] along with the bones and tusk of the mammoth, had been unearthed in excavations that were being made in Gray's Inn, but this was glibly attributed to the "Ancient Britons," and no more was thought of the matter. Neolithic arrow-

[1] It is figured in Leland's *Collectanea*, and in Evans' *Ancient Stone Implements of Great Britain*, p. 582.

heads, too, had long been known in Italy, Scotland, and elsewhere, but these were described as elfin bolts or thunderstones, to which magic properties were attributed, and which were often set in gold and employed as charms or amulets; these discoveries, however, led to nothing, for if the age is not prepared for a discovery it falls barren and fruitless to the ground.

In this respect, as in every other, the education of the human race has been along progressive lines; and what is dark and mysterious in one age becomes clear and luminous in the next.

It was not till 1797 that the true significance of worked flints began to be recognised, when Mr. John Frere, in describing his discoveries at Hoxne in Suffolk, referred these implements to "a very remote period, and to a people who had not the use of metals."

More than forty years passed away, and then in 1841 M. Boucher de Perthes discovered evidences of man's existence in Western Europe at the time when the upper gravels of the Somme Valley were deposited, and in 1846 he electrified the world with the publication of his discovery. Along with the worked flints which were the proofs of man's craftsmanship, were found the remains of numbers of extinct animals, including the mammoth, woolly rhinoceros, urus, cave-lion and cave-hyæna, as well as those of the horse and reindeer. "For seven

years longer," as Lord Avebury says, "M. Boucher de Perthes made few converts; he was looked upon as an enthusiast, almost a madman," for if his discoveries were to be admitted it was recognised that the existence of man upon the earth extended back to the Quaternary Epoch, and almost to the confines of the Tertiary—and another nail was driven into the literal interpretation of the Mosaic story of Creation. But from 1853, when scientists felt themselves driven to admit the truth of the discoveries, evidences of man's long existence on the earth have been accumulating in ever increasing numbers, and the trickling stream, as I said above, has become a mighty torrent which the barriers raised by an antiquated theology are powerless to withstand.

We can here only recapitulate as briefly as possible the present state of knowledge on the subject, and would refer those who wish for fuller information to the Notes and the works referred to in the Bibliography.

Much that will be said will perhaps appear the merest commonplace to many of those who belong to this ancient shrine of learning, but for the sake of those who are not so well informed, it is advisable to state plainly how the matter now stands.

It was soon seen that the implement discovered in Gray's Inn in 1690, and those found by Mr. Frere at Hoxne in Suffolk in 1797, belonged to

the same age as that of M. Boucher de Perthes' discoveries, viz., to the River-drift, or Diluvium, as it is called on the Continent, in the Quaternary Epoch; and now that men's eyes were opened to see, evidences of man's handiwork were continually being brought to light from the gravels deposited where ancient rivers flowed, but which now lie many hundreds of feet above the level of the present streams, not only on the Continent and in England, but in all parts of the world. At the same time, the exploration of Kent's Cavern, near Torquay, of the Caves in Derbyshire, and then that wonderful series of discoveries in the caves of Belgium, France, and elsewhere, to which reference will be made when we come to consider the condition of our earliest ancestors, made it plain that the men of the Drift and the men of the Caves lived at a period when the Continent of Europe stretched far out into the Atlantic. The British Islands formed the western extremity of that Continent; a great river flowed, where the Channel now divides England from France, westwards to the ocean; and the Rhine and Elbe carried the drainage of the Continent through a great valley, now covered by the North Sea, into the Polar Ocean. About the time when these discoveries were taking place, the Northern archæologists, of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, had been led by their investigation of the kitchen-middens, barrows, and other remains of early man,

to divide the prehistoric period into the three Ages of Stone, Bronze, and Iron, and these divisions all subsequent research has proved to be correct. Further study of the Stone Age proved that it should be subdivided into the Old and the New Stone Ages, or, to use the now universally accepted names given to them by Lord Avebury, the Palæolithic and Neolithic Ages. To the first belong all the implements of the Drift and the Caves,—roughly chipped implements of flint, chert, and other stones, as well as many fashioned from reindeer and other bones, such as harpoon-heads, needles, awls, borers, and such like—all of a definite and unmistakable type; to the latter belong the ground or carefully chipped arrowheads, spearheads, the polished celts and tools of various kinds, too well known and too widely distributed to need detailed description here.

Of late years the researches of Mr. Harrison at Ightham, in Kent (the deductions from which were sanctioned by Professor Prestwich), and of many students abroad, among whom it may suffice to mention M. Rutot, M. Boule, and others, have made it probable that an earlier stage of the Stone Age than the Palæolithic must be recognised in Western Europe, and to this the name of Eolithic has been given; if the very rude and primitive implements belonging to this period are finally recognised and admitted as of human origin, the beginnings of

"Man" will date back into the Tertiary Epoch. But this is of no consequence for the purpose of our study in these Lectures. The time since man appeared upon the globe is in any case a very long one,—Professor Haeckel dates it back 300,000 years,—but admitting, as we do, the existence of man in the first Inter-glacial Period in Europe, his earliest appearance cannot be less than from 80,000 to 120,000 years ago, according to the data of the Cave deposits and the River-drift.

The cradle of the human race may well have been somewhere in the uplands of Asia, and those who migrated thence to the fertile plains watered by the Euphrates, the Tigris, and the Nile may have reached at a comparatively early date the stage of culture represented by the Neolithic Age; but to see man in his beginnings we must note the remains he has left behind him in Europe, together with some few relics of himself.

Not in a beautiful garden specially prepared did man first awake to consciousness, as ancient poets dreamed, but in a world in which he had to bend his energies to an unceasing conflict with the forces of Nature, and in which he was surrounded by foes; and it was to this very conflict, and to the fact that, if he would survive, he must use his wits to master those foes, that all his upward progress may be traced. Those who arrived in Babylonia and Egypt, and those who

travelled Eastwards and settled in what is now and has been for ages the unchanging empire of China, must have passed through the earliest stages, and reached the organisation represented by the union of clans and tribes, characteristic of the Neolithic Age, ere they left their primeval abodes, but in Europe we can behold the progress of the strife, and trace out all the stages of man's gradual emergence from a condition of life in which he was little removed above the animals amidst which he dwelt, through savagery and barbarism to civilisation.

Of Eolithic, *i.e.* Pre-glacial, man, in the Tertiary Period, we have evidence only in the shape of the rudest flint implements, just sufficiently shaped to testify to intelligent design, discovered in the Pre-glacial gravels of the Kentish Plateau, and in Belgium; and although a good deal of controversy has been raised lately as to whether many of the supposed Eolithic implements may not have been naturally formed by the action of rolling in ice and water (as similar forms have been produced by artificial processes in the cement factories at Mantes), yet a sufficient number remain to prove, in my opinion, the existence of a being on the way to become, if not already arrived at the stage of being, man in the Tertiary Epoch. I lay no stress on the Calaveras skull found in America, because grave doubts are still expressed as to its

genuineness, but if genuine, it proves that man was already "man" at that remote period.

When we arrive at Quaternary or Palæolithic man we are on sure ground, and not only are the evidences of his existence since the close of the Tertiary Epoch decisive, but the investigations of a host of modern scientists have enabled a precise classification of his progress to be drawn up.

In the early days of anthropological study the division of "The Stone Age" into the two groups of Palæolithic and Neolithic, the former comprising all the remains of the Cave men and the River-drift indiscriminately, was considered sufficient, and, the geologists being satisfied with one great Ice Age, it was argued that man was certainly Post-glacial, and that the Palæolithic Age embraced one continuous period from man's first appearance, when the great Ice-cap began to recede until the commencement of modern conditions in the Neolithic Age.

It is now established, however, as will be seen from the Note at the end of this Lecture,[1] where a Table is given, that there were no less than four Glacial Periods in the Northern hemisphere, each of varying duration, separated from one another by Inter-glacial Periods of equally varying length, during each of which man existed; and a distinct advance can be perceived as we move forward,

[1] See Note A, p. 126.

until, with the passing away of the last great Ice-cap, we arrive at the present condition of things and the Neolithic Age.

Man, as we know him, first appears during the first Inter-glacial Period. His remains are found in the River-drift of the Somme, the Thames, and elsewhere, in all parts of Europe and England; also in Caves at Brixham, Kent's Hole, Robin-Hood (Derbyshire), Mentone, Spy, Neanderthal, and in the Cevennes and elsewhere in France. At Spy and Neanderthal remains of his skull and other bones, as well as implements, were found. Thus it will be seen that there is no difference in period between the River-drift and the earliest Cave men. From the fact that the first discoveries were made by M. Boucher de Perthes on the Somme, this period is called the Chelléo-Mousterian Period, and man was then contemporary with the Elephas antiquus, meridionalis, and primigenius, and with other fauna belonging to a warm climate; physically, the race of Spy or Neanderthal, as it has been called, must have been tall and strong and well developed, though the receding forehead and prognathic jaw point to low mental attainments, which is just what might be expected.

The second Inter-glacial Period is known as the Solutrian, and the remains of this period are found wholly in the Caves, most of them the same as in the preceding. During this period the climate was

much colder than during the last, and man is now contemporary with the mammoth, the cave lion, cave bear, and cave hyæna, and he commences his career as a hunter by the chase of the stag and other cervine animals, of the wild-horse, and of animals useful for food. He no longer fashions rude implements only for slaughter, but by making scrapers, awls, and bone pins and needles, etc., he shows that he is beginning to clothe himself in the skins of slain beasts, and has made a further advance on the road that leads from utter savagery to barbarism.

In the succeeding, or third Inter-glacial Period, which is known as the Magdalenian, from the celebrated cave of La Madeleine in the Dordogne, the climate is still colder than in the last, though it improves towards the end, and man is now contemporary with the reindeer throughout the whole of Central Europe, and with the elk in Western Europe, while the wild beasts remain pretty much the same, and the struggle for existence being more severe, adverse conditions of climate being added to his continual warfare with his foes in the natural world, man takes another step forward. It is from this period that are derived the earliest specimens of man's skill as an artist, and the most wonderful circumstance about this is that the first examples of his art display a finished perfection, which entirely died out with the coming of the

next and last Glacial Period, and to which Neolithic man never attained. Whether these drawings have any connection with the dawning of a religious consciousness in man will be discussed in our next Lecture, but to speak of them now only from the artistic standpoint, they merit comparison with some of the masterpieces of later ages, and do not lose by it. No more vigorous or lifelike drawings can be conceived than those of the mammoth, and the reindeer feeding, from the grotto of Thayngen and the Cave of La Madeleine, and other specimens drawn on bone or ivory; and, more surprising still, those drawings of the mammoth, the bison, and other animals, which have been discovered on the walls and roofs in the dim recesses of the caves where the hunter sought shelter from the cold, which at this period obtained for nine months of the year. To quote M. Salomon Reinach, in his brief survey of the art of this period: "During the last few years," says this writer, "prehistoric paintings of the highest interest have been discovered in the caves of Périgord and the Pyrenees. In those caves of France where it has been found possible to observe the superposition of the various strata, it has been found that figures in the round, carved in stone or in the bones of mammoth and reindeer, lay buried more deeply, and are consequently earlier than those carved in relief or drawn."

It may be mentioned, in passing, that various

human figures or figurines belonging to this period have been found with the other remains, from which it would appear that the Magdalenian race was steatopygous—*i.e.*, characterised by a marked development of the hips, such as may be seen in some of the African tribes of the present day, and which is also characteristic of some of the earliest inhabitants of Egypt. To continue: "Drawings made with a style, the products of this art in its greatest perfection, are contemporary with paintings which show the same characteristics, and deserve no less admiration. Of these characteristics the most striking is realism. Fancy seems to be absolutely excluded; whether represented alone or in groups, the animals are depicted with a correctness to which we find no parallel in the art of the modern savage. The next characteristic is sobriety. There are no useless details; certain animal forms of this period, either engraved or painted, will bear comparison with the fine animal studies of modern artists. Finally—and this is perhaps the most extraordinary trait of all—the artist of the reindeer age is in love with life and movement: he likes to represent his animals in lively and picturesque attitudes; he seizes and reproduces their movements with extraordinary precision. It must, of course, be understood that these eulogies do not apply to all the works of art of the Cave dwellers. Then, as always, there were gifted and mediocre artists; but they apply to some thirty

or forty objects, carved, engraved, or painted, which may be accounted masterpieces among the hundreds that have been collected and reproduced. How and where was this art developed? It is evident that its finest productions were the final outcome of a long progression. The man of the Quaternary Period, like the modern man, was perhaps born with the artistic instinct, but he was not born an artist. Many generations had to pass before he had learnt to draw the outline of an animal correctly with his sharpened flint, before his first essays, his first scrawls, took on the dignity of true works of art. Our knowledge of this period is as yet far too restricted to enable us to trace the stages of this development. It is indeed possible, and even probable, that it began in another part of Europe; for the reindeer, which no longer existed in France in the warm phase of the Quaternary Epoch, must then have abounded in the more northern regions, and there is every reason to suppose that the ancestors of the reindeer hunters of Périgord and the Pyrenees flourished together with their favourite game. The evolution of art, however, cannot have made much progress in this primitive field; and no doubt it was in the basin of the Garonne that it was accelerated and accomplished. When the cold period came to an end, the reindeer disappeared almost suddenly, and was replaced by the stag. At this epoch, which marks the close of the Quaternary

Period, the drawings become rare, and finally disappear altogether. The civilisation of the reindeer hunter seems to have died out, or to have migrated with the reindeer towards the north of Europe. But so far no trace of it has come to light, nor has it been possible to establish any definite connection between the art of the reindeer hunter and that of civilisations of great antiquity, though certainly more recent than theirs, such as those of Egypt and Babylonia.

"Thus we find that the art of Quaternary France forms a clearly defined phase in the very genesis of art history. We may trace the successive appearance of the desire for symmetry, of sculpture, bas-relief engraving, and painting; of all the loftier forms of art, architecture alone is absent."[1]

This is high, but not too high, praise, and it testifies to the lofty place in intellectual attainments to which man had attained by the time the fourth and last Glacial Period supervened, and buried him and his achievements in an oblivion which endured until the present day.

Whether he had reached the stage of even dawning religious ideas, and if so, of what sort these were, is a consideration which, as stated above, must be deferred for the present; but one thing at least is clear, that in all this long development, of which Anthropology leaves no doubt, no room is found for any such experience, as a matter of con-

[1] Reinach, *Story of Art throughout the Ages*, pp. 5, 6.

crete fact, as is described in the story told in Genesis iii.

What was the origin of that story, and what value must be assigned to it in the religious sphere, in the light of present-day knowledge, will appear later on. So far we have seen man making a continual upward progress, to the extent that his circumstances permitted, in the arts and crafts of life, until he stands before us a consummate artist, but beyond the limits of his requirements he was no doubt intellectually a child, and spiritually he may be said to have been hardly born. He was perhaps organised in isolated family groups, the idea of property in wife and children and goods probably existed, but there was as yet no tribal organisation, and no social arrangements; with these commence ideas of right and wrong, in conforming or otherwise to the rule of the tribe, and this again is a step in advance. When religious ideas began to be fixed, a supernatural sanction for "right-doing," and like punishments for wrong-doing, with the institution of wise men, both prophets and priests, and the notion of communion and propitiation, would soon find place, as among the Australian and African natives to-day. But we have not arrived at this point yet.

In speaking of the "Ages" of Stone, Bronze, and Iron, it must be borne in mind that no hard and fast line of demarcation can be set as their

boundaries either for a *terminus a quo* or for a *terminus ad quem*, nor can any fixed dates be assigned which invariably apply. Here again our illustration from Architecture applies,[1] as it does to the evolution of life on the earth.

In Western Europe there seems to be a great gap between the disappearance of Palæolithic man and the appearance of the Neolithic races, marked by the subsidence of the land and the severing of the British Islands from the Continent.

The last Ice Age passed away in Europe some 8000 or 10,000 years before Christ, by which time the configuration of the land and the climate, the flora and the fauna, had become much what they are to-day, and the last reindeer had disappeared from the Alps and the Pyrenees after the last mammoth. How soon afterwards Neolithic man began to spread himself abroad we cannot tell, but when he first appears he was at a relatively low stage, and possessed not a vestige of the artistic abilities of his predecessor. At this time he was already dwelling in the Nile Valley, and probably in the delta of the Euphrates and Tigris, but while he has left abundant traces of his occupation of the former, those of the latter are but few.

Visitors to the British Museum may see one of the earliest examples of Neolithic burial in the Egyptian Gallery, where, in the sarcophagus, as they

[1] *Vide supra*, p. 46.

were found, lie the remains, bitumenised into a mummy, with rude specimens of pottery around him, of an individual of the red-haired Neolithic race of Egypt. He is buried in the fashion peculiar to man in the Neolithic stage of culture all the world over, viz., on his side, with his knees drawn up to his chin, as A. Lang describes it:—

> "He buried his dead with his toes
> Tucked up: a peculiar plan;
> Till his knees came right under his nose:
> 'Twas the method of primitive man."

The line of march of the Neolithic peoples may be traced from their original home in Central Asia, through Asia Minor, across Europe and North Africa, to Western Spain and France and Britain, by the *dolmens* in which they buried their dead, fashioned on the model of the dwellings which they inhabited when alive, and placed on the summit of some natural hill or concealed in the interior of an artificial long barrow; and by the *menhirs* (to give them their Celtic name) and stone avenues and circles which they erected. These latter include not only the smaller examples, but even such gigantic specimens of man's workmanship as Carnac and Avebury and Stonehenge, as Sir Norman Lockyer has proved, which had been supposed hitherto to be temples erected in the Bronze Age. In the graves they placed rude pottery, often unbaked (not fashioned on the wheel as in later times, but moulded

by hand), weapons and implements, beads and other ornaments for the use of the departed ; and, at the burial of a chief, his wives, attendants, dogs and other animals, were slain, that he might not feel himself lonely on the long journey, a custom which has continued in Africa down to the present day. All this is evidence of a belief in a future life, and, together with the stone circles and menhirs, testifies to a dawning religious consciousness—of what sort will appear in our next study. The summit of the long barrow was usually planted with trees, and when the grave was on a natural hill, beside the dolmen stood the menhir, and a grove of trees surrounded it.

The Neolithic peoples in Europe belonged to the great Iberian race, which was non-Aryan, probably Turanian, and is represented to-day by the Berbers in North Africa and the Basques in Spain and France; their blood is largely intermixed with that of their later Aryan conquerors, the Celtic and Teutonic nations, and may be easily traced, where it exists, as in the short, squat, dark-haired people of South Wales, who are the modern descendants of the ancient Silures described by Tacitus.

Neolithic man had attained one great step in advance of his Palæolithic predecessor—he was no longer dependent upon the produce of the chase or of fishing for his subsistence. He had learnt the art of agriculture, and was a keeper of cattle and

sheep; he had, moreover, tamed the horse, the dog, and the cat to be his servants. The most advanced vestiges of the Neolithic civilisation and culture are to be seen in the Lake-dwellings of Switzerland, where, as at Robenhausen and elsewhere, we can discover the whole domestic economy of these primitive people, and where continuous occupation can be traced for several thousand years, through the Bronze and Iron Ages, down to the period of the Roman conquest.

The arts of painting and engraving seem never to have been attained by the Neolithic peoples, and do not reappear before the Bronze Age and the period of the Mycenean civilisation in the Mediterranean lands, but their weapons and implements are beautifully fashioned. Their arrowheads and spearheads and celts are not merely of chipped flint or other stone, but are for the most part finely polished; they made numberless human and animal figurines, and even sometimes carved large blocks of stone into a rude semblance of the human figure, usually female, and often without mouths, like the figures found by Dr. Schliemann at Troy and Mycenæ (mistaken at first for owls), with what object we will not now discuss; while, in some localities, as in Caria, Cyprus, Crete, and Spain and Portugal, they seem to have arrived at an alphabetiform method of conveying ideas anterior to the formation of the Egyptian hieroglyphic or the

Babylonian and Assyrian cuneiform scripts, or even the Chinese syllabaries, out of the former of which the Phœnician and Hebrew alphabets were developed; and it is a question now whether the later Greek and Latin alphabets were derived from these latter, or not rather from this prehistoric Mediterranean script, through the Bronze Age Mycenean culture. Curiously enough, the Neolithic alphabetiform signs attach themselves to similar signs which are found on pebbles among the relics of the Cave-dwellers at Mas d'Azil, discovered by M. Piette, the celebrated French anthropologist, whose lamented death occurred in June 1906, and in these we have the only link connecting the Cave men of the Palæolithic Age with their Neolithic successors, except that which consists in sculpture in the round—*i.e.*, the figurines of women and animals, and in these the later fabricators show no advance, but rather a falling off in style.

A remarkable similarity of form displays itself in the figurines fashioned by the Neolithic peoples of the prehistoric period wherever they may be found, whether among the early inhabitants of Egypt, as shown by M. Capart in his excellent digest of the labours of those who have explored the earliest tombs at Nagada and elsewhere, entitled *Primitive Art in Egypt*; or among the ancient Finnish population of Central Europe, themselves belonging to the great non-Aryan, and probably Iberian race, as

may be seen in the Hon. John Abercromby's *Pre- and Proto-historic Finns*, or among the Lake-dwellers of Switzerland, or the Neolithic peoples of Western Europe and our own Islands, testifying to identity of origin, to intercourse along prehistoric trade-routes, and, as we shall see, to community of religious beliefs. All this will be found more fully described in the works referred to in the Bibliography, where also the similarity between these forms with those fashioned by peoples in the Neolithic stage of culture at the present day—*e.g.*, the Negro peoples of Africa and the South Sea Islands, but not, or at least to a very small extent, the natives of Australia—is pointed out. The primitive art of Egypt, where history begins some 4000 years B.C., goes back for thousands of years before that time, but it held its own in Europe right through the Bronze Age, and even down to almost historic times.

Another phase of Neolithic art is seen in the cup and ring markings on rocks, and also on stones, pebbles, and shells, together with circular and spiral drawings, which are characteristic of the Age all the world over, and are found among the natives of Australia to-day. Judging by what we know of their present-day significance, these seem to point to the arrangement of society on a totemistic basis, and can be best described, as I have ventured to do elsewhere, as "the heraldry of primitive man." The spirals, perfected and made more complex, survived

into the Bronze Age, as may be seen on the tombs at New Grange in Ireland; and became characteristic of the Mycenean civilisation, as may be seen in the ceilings and wall paintings of Knossos and Mycenæ and Tiryns; these finally achieved their highest development in the returning spiral characteristic of Late-Celtic art, as may be seen in the weapons and ornaments of that age; they are continued in lineal succession in the MSS. for which the Christian art of Ireland is celebrated, as in the Books of Kells and Armagh in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin; they were carried across the sea to reappear in the Lindisfarne MS. of the Gospels, and are even found on Saxon fonts, as at Deerhurst in Gloucestershire.

But this consideration of the origin and development of spiral ornamentation has carried us far afield. The Neolithic Age in Egypt goes back to at least 10,000 B.C.; it terminated in Northern Europe by about 1500 B.C., by which time the Egyptians had passed through their Bronze Age, and had arrived at the Golden Age of the 18th Dynasty, when they were in the full enjoyment of Iron Age civilisation, while the races of the Egean were flourishing under the Mycenean Bronze Age civilisation, which was destined to be swept away by the irruption of the barbarians from the North, known to the Greeks as the Dorian invasion.

In Northern Europe the Bronze Age reached its highest point with the civilisation represented

by the discoveries in the cemetery at Hallstatt, and by the Etruscans; it was derived in large part from the pre-existing Mediterranean Mycenean civilisation, and lasted a thousand years, when it gave place to the Iron Age civilisation which marks the empire of the Celts, and which found its highest expression in the culture known as that of La Tène.

In one sense the whole civilised world is at the present time in the Iron Age, which, however, has merged during the last century into the age of steel, steam, and electricity; but what we have to remember is that these succeeding "Ages" represent succeeding "stages of culture" in the ever-advancing upward progress and evolution of mankind.

Neolithic man was succeeded in the Nile and Euphrates Valleys by a bronze-using people, and already, as soon as history begins with Menes, 4500 B.C., and Sargon I. and his son, Naram-Sin, 3800 B.C., they are in the Bronze Age, and use stone implements, such as knives, only for sacrificial and ceremonial purposes, as the Israelites did in the time of Joshua, and as the Romans did down to the end of the Republic.

In Central and Western Europe Neolithic man gave way before the bronze-using Celts, who arrived in two streams, first the Goidelic branch, and then, some centuries later, the Brythonic branch, who in the third century B.C. had founded a mighty empire which extended from the Black Sea to the

confines of the Western Ocean. These were in their turn driven into ever narrowing limits by the irruption of the Teutonic nations, who received from them, nevertheless, the rudiments of Iron Age culture, and brought with them those tribal arrangements which lie at the root of the present organisation of society. Rome never conquered the Teutons, but they, in their turn, felt the pressure of succeeding hordes of barbarians from the East, until at length the whole fabric of Roman civilisation toppled to the ground, and the foundations of modern Europe were laid.

Meanwhile the Bronze Age culture of the Mediterranean, to which the name of Mycenean has been given, from the vestiges of it discovered in recent years in Asia Minor, Crete, and Greece, perished before the assaults of barbarians from the North about 1000 B.C.; the great empires of Egypt and Babylon ran their course; the Phœnicians—the English of the old world—became a great nation founded on sea-power, colonised all the shores of the Mediterranean, traded to Britain and circumnavigated Africa; the Hebrews were established in Palestine, never a great power, but destined to have an abiding influence on the spiritual destiny of mankind; and Greece and Rome flourished and passed away.

Time was when man first opened his eyes upon the world in which he found himself called to live

as a conscious being. Feeble in his physical frame, not armed with tooth and claw like the beasts among which he dwelt, he would soon have succumbed in the ceaseless war of Nature had it not been for his mental endowments. Ere long some genius arose, who discovered that, armed with a stone implement, fashioned more or less "by art and man's device," he was more than a match for his foes, whether they were beasts or other human beings like himself, and soon tools for the necessities of existence began to be made as well as weapons of war or for the chase. No monument commemorates this genius, no document records his name, but his fame deserves to be as great as that of any inventor of our own day; and from that time to this man's advance in the arts and crafts of life has been continuous and unceasing—*i.e.*, where the conditions have been favourable to such advance. Many races have never progressed beyond the Palæolithic stage, as the Esquimaux, who are held to be the nearest representatives to-day of Palæolithic man in Europe, and the now extinct Tasmanians.

More still have never progressed beyond the Neolithic stage until they came in contact with more highly civilised peoples, as the greater part of the North American Indians,—though the Mexicans and Peruvians seem to have been in the Bronze Age stage of culture (at which they had arrived independently of the rest of the world, owing

probably to the favourable conditions in which they found themselves), and many tribes used implements made of native copper, particularly those around Lake Superior,—the inhabitants of the South Sea Islands, Australia, many parts of Asia and most parts of Africa; for the majority of these peoples it has no doubt been a misfortune that they have had to pass *per saltum* from their own primitive condition into the very midst of our civilisation, without any intermediate stage to soften the abruptness of the transition.

Long ages have passed since the Neolithic stage was left behind in Babylonia and Egypt, where, in the alluvial lands watered by the great rivers Nile, Euphrates, and Tigris, man seems, so to say, to have ripened early, and where history begins in the fifth millennium B.C.

China, also, must very early have emerged into the Bronze, and thence into the Iron, Age, but her isolation until recent times kept her civilisation distinct and separate from the rest of the world, and we have no means of discovering when the working of metals first began there.

For us the interest centres rather in the plain of Babylonia than in the Nile Valley, for with the rise there of organised empire under Sargon I., Naram-Sin, and their successors, consequent on the discovery of the smelting of copper and its blend with tin to make bronze, also arose organised

religion and those stories of the origin of gods and men which were carried by the Israelites in their migration Westward, and which finally crystallised into the monotheistic narrative of the earliest portion of Genesis. For in this respect Israel is one of the youngest of the nations, deriving her civilisation and her religion from the East, the child of Babylonia, as the story of Abraham's parentage shows, with no genius for native art or commerce, but with an inborn genius for religion, which we are surely justified in ascribing to the same Spirit who has guided all the evolutions of Nature and of Man; a genius that, through the long line of the Prophets, manifested an ever-increasing distinctness of utterance till it culminated in the Christ.

To understand the place occupied by Israel and Israel's sacred books in the scheme of the world's religions, it will be necessary to investigate man's earliest religious ideas, as they are manifested in the most primitive races of ancient and modern times, and in doing so we shall be helped to realise how much of primitive man there was in old Israel—aye, and how much there is still in ourselves.

This Lecture has reached its limit, for the question of the origin and progress of religious ideas carries us beyond the point where we must now pause; but enough has been said in this brief and all too rapid survey to enable us to realise

something as to the condition of the world when a being worthy to be called "man" first opened his eyes upon it, and as to the conditions of those earliest ancestors of our race.

In this long story, in which we have only too briefly surveyed the fortunes of the human race since the disappearance of the last Ice Age and the commencement of the present order of things, we see the same phenomena as before — continued progress in the arts and crafts of life, continued advance among the higher races from savagery, through barbarism, to civilisation, conditioned by struggle and the survival of the fittest, in which, as in the world of plants and animals, Natural Selection plays its part. Nowhere is there any room for a literal acceptation of the story told in Genesis iii.; but everywhere, as we shall see, we find man becoming more and more a religious being, until the universal animism with which he begins passes through fetishism into idolatry and polytheism; this is the characteristic of the great organised empires, and develops into the mythologies of Greece and Rome; among the Semites each tribe or nation has its own supreme or national god, originally the Sun-god, or Baal, the Life-giver, the Father who has over against him the Earth-mother, as his feminine counterpart and the completion of his being. In this way Israel first conceived of Yahweh, who

was, as we shall see, her national god; it was this conception that made it so easy for the people to syncretise his worship with the Canaanite Baals, as was done all through her history, equally under the two kingdoms as in the undivided kingdom and in the times of the Judges, and to import into it practices derived from earliest antiquity.

But God had a different fate in store for Israel, and for the world through Israel, and therefore His Spirit, which lived and moved in all things and in all men, imparted a special inspiration to certain chosen men in Israel, men who had a deeper insight and a fuller vision than belongs to the ordinary run of mortals, and through these, the long line of the prophets, He progressively unfolded the revelation of Himself. Gradually, as time went on, and through the vicissitudes of her strange history, in which she found herself at length dominated and brought almost to the verge of extinction, after untold sufferings, by the great world-powers,—first of Egypt, from which she was wonderfully delivered to begin her existence as a nation, and then of Assyria and Babylon, where five-sixths of her people lost not only their nationality and independence, but their individuality, and were absorbed by the conquerors, and whence one-sixth alone returned, no longer a nation nor independent, but a Church,—Israel learnt the unity, the majesty, and the holiness of God; with this she learnt also

an ever-deepening sense of sin, no longer merely as a ceremonial uncleanness, consequent on the breaking of a taboo, as will be later on explained, but as error inherent in man's nature, in itself abhorrent to the holiness of God, due to rebellion, and, as manifested in outward act, needing propitiation as well as forgiveness. Then it was that pious souls in Israel gathered together and collected the ancient stories as to man's origin, which had been long current among the Semites in Babylonia, and had been woven into a grand epic of the conflict of the gods with the serpent of Chaos, Tiâmat, and of the power acquired over men by this serpent of Chaos, who hated the introduction of Order into the Universe, and gave them the monotheistic colouring and the form which, after many editings and in different periods, they have assumed in the early chapters of Genesis. Recognising that man has not, in his progress upwards, followed the line marked out for him, but that, owing to a moral obliquity, due to the nature he shares in common with the animals from which he has sprung, and to the freedom of his will, the necessary concomitant of intelligence,—in the possession of which, as the only denizen of earth who is conscious of himself, *i.e.*, the only one who possesses the divine gift of personality, lies the truth that he is "made in the image of God,"—he has chosen the life of self-pleasing, which is the easier

way, and needs to be raised out of it into the life of self-sacrifice by "a power not his own that makes for righteousness," *i.e.*, by the Spirit of God, in which alone the image of God can be restored;—recognising all this in a dim and half-childish fashion, they told the stories of Creation and of the Fall in the only way in which they could picture the facts to themselves, or the people of their own age could understand them; and they pointed ever forward in images derived from the sufferings of their own people to a Deliverer who should come from God, and who, Himself human and divine, should "loose the bands of wickedness and let the oppressed go free."

In the stories of the antediluvians they picture their conception of man's material progress as it had been handed down in other ancient stories current among the Semites, and in the story of the Deluge they picture the judgment of God against a self-willed race, which is again exemplified in the story of the Tower of Babel, the locality of the tale revealing plainly from what source it was derived; and then, just as God had a chosen race and a chosen servant to rescue from the Deluge, so later on He had a chosen servant in Abraham, whom He called out of Chaldæa to be the ancestor of the Hebrew people. Thereupon the story narrows itself down to the fortunes of the Patriarchs until the entry of Jacob into Egypt

and the four hundred years' sojourn there. These stories are none of them history, but they give us a priceless insight into the ideas of their authors (lost in the dim mist of ages) and editors as to the origin and development of mankind, and into the life and circumstances of the times from which they come down.

From these we may discover that, although, as Prehistoric Archæology surely teaches us, "man is but a thing of naught, his days pass away like a shadow," although with all his upward progress in material civilisation he remains morally impotent and spiritually dead, yet he is at the same time a being of religious instincts and immortal destinies; for, hid in the bosom of God, there lies the Eternal Son, the Word of the Father, who in the fulness of time shall be made flesh and dwell among us; in whom we behold the glory of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, Himself the Archetype and Head of humanity, who by uniting man to Himself, and in Himself to God, shall teach the beauty of self-sacrifice, and redeem man from sin, which is, in its essence, selfishness and self-will, and thus fulfil the splendid vision of the Psalmist: "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels to crown him with glory and honour" in that day to which all creation, now groaning and travailing together in pain, tends, and for which it yearns, when "the tabernacle of

God shall be with men, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God."[1]

How man pursued his path of moral and religious development, and the part which Israel played in the great drama, will come before us in our next and succeeding Lectures.

NOTE A, p. 101.

The question of the existence of pre-glacial man was at one time of great importance, and, the Glacial Period being regarded as continuous and of long duration, it was held that Palæolithic man must of necessity have been altogether post-glacial, in spite of accumulating evidence to the contrary. Recent research has, however, shown that there was more than one Glacial Period, with intervening periods when the climate was warm and genial, and a systematic study of the remains of the Palæolithic Age has enabled a definite classification of them to be made. I have followed Dr. Hoernes' system in the text, and will here subjoin the Table in which he exhibits it, as it is the one which the anthropological world accepts to-day:—

I. First Glacial Period (Geikie, Pliocene).

1. First Inter-glacial Period: Deposit of Tilloux-Taubach (with Elephas meridionalis, antiquus, and primigenius), or Chelléo-Mousterian.

II. Second Glacial Period: Gap (at least east of France).

[1] See Note B, p. 129.

2. Second Inter-glacial Period: Mammoth Age, or Solutrian (cave bears, lions, and hyænas).

III. Third Glacial Period: end of the Older Pleistocene Fauna; presence of Arctic animals (reindeer).

3. Third Inter-glacial Period:

(*a*) Reindeer Age, or Magdalenian, over the whole of Europe.

(*b*) Stag Age, or Asylian (Tourassian), in Western Europe.

IV. Fourth Glacial Period: Arisian (étage coquillier), in Southern France. Simultaneous gap over the rest of Europe.

4. Post-glacial: Neolithic Age.

The names given to the classified remains of Palæolithic man are derived from the localities in which the chief deposits have been found. In England, deposits belonging to the several periods have been found as follows:—

1. Chelléo-Mousterian: The alluvial gravels of the Thames, the Ouse, and the Avon; Brixham, Kent's, Robin Hood and Wookey-Hole Caverns.

2. Solutrian: Robin Hood and Creswell Caverns, Derbyshire; and Kent's Cavern, near Torquay.

3. Magdalenian: Kent's Cavern and Church Hole and Robin Hood Caverns, near Creswell. It was in Church Hole Cavern that the solitary specimen of the art of Palæolithic man—the horse's head engraved on bone—in England was found, which proves the identity of the Palæolithic race in this country with its contemporaries on the Continent. But it must be remembered that the "British

Islands" did not then exist. The "Continent" stretched in one unbroken sweep of land many hundreds of miles westwards of Ireland towards Greenland. Deposits belonging to this age are found universally from Southern Russia, Russian Poland, and Austria-Hungary, through Germany, Switzerland, Italy, France, Spain, and Belgium, to England, but, curiously enough, not in Scandinavia nor in Ireland.[1]

Thus, according to Dr. Hoernes, there were no less than four Glacial Periods in Europe, and the earliest positive remains of the human race ascend to the first Inter-glacial Period immediately after the Pliocene. Eolithic, or Tertiary, man, the direct descendant of the *Pithecanthropus erectus*, goes back to definitely pre-glacial times, and as we watch the process of evolution, and note the condition of mental and physical development attained by Palæolithic man, we should have to postulate his existence even if no traces of him whatever remained.

Thus the antiquity of man is enormous; and the Palæolithic Age must have endured for untold centuries, when we think what must have been the duration of those seven alternating periods of cold and heat immediately before the present condition of things in Europe was ushered in!

Indeed, we may ourselves be living, for aught we know, in an Inter-glacial Period now, and some geologists think that another period of cold may supervene about ten thousand years hence. *Qui vivra, verra!*

[1] Hoernes, *Der Diluviale Mensch in Europa*, pp. 7–12, 186–188.

NOTE B, p. 126.

A great deal has been said lately on the subject of the so-called "New Theology," as propounded by its latest protagonist, the Rev. R. J. Campbell, at the City Temple. Mr. Campbell seems to be obsessed by a feeling of the necessity for the re-statement of ancient theological beliefs in harmony with the data of modern science, and in so far he is perfectly justified, and his aim is that set before the writer and the readers of the present Lectures.

But in speaking as he does of the Divine Immanence, as though it were some new idea discovered by himself and revealed now for the first time to the British public, and of the "humanity of God and the divinity of man," he shows a want of appreciation of the true significance of Sin and of the real meaning of Atonement. He has not grasped either the teaching of the Old Theology, properly understood, which (as may be seen in the Fathers, and in the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas among the medieval doctors, and among moderns, of Maurice, Kingsley, Robertson of Brighton, Bishop Gore, to mention no others and these only English and of our own Church), is not bound up with forensic notions of Substitution, but is founded on the idea of the Eternal Son made man, and, as such, the Archetype and Head of humanity; nor has he grasped the true meaning of the teaching of Archæology and Anthropology as to Man. The Divine Immanence

is, as we have seen, true and needed emphasising, as against Deism, but the Divine transcendence is equally true as against Pantheism, and needs emphasising to-day as much as it ever did—God in, and yet over against, and above, His creation; three Divine Persons in one Godhead, in whom and through whom and to whom are all things; and Man, endowed with personality, which implies free will, and not only possessed of the possibility of choosing the wrong in place of the right, but who, as all his history proves, both in the race and the individual, has actually done so.

The best exposition of the "New Theology" in its true outlines is to be found in the *Catechism* propounded by Sir Oliver Lodge in the July 1906 part of the *Hibbert Journal*, which has since been published in book form, and, as will be seen, in it is left full scope for the Catholic Church, or any other body of professing Christians, to put forward their own distinctive views of the Christian Faith.[1]

[1] Sir Oliver Lodge, *The Substance of Faith*. But cf. the *Hibbert Journal*, vol. v. pp. 893 *seq.*

LECTURE THE FOURTH

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF

"It may be said that man is religious in the lowest sense because he is an animal; religious in the higher sense because he is a man. The material of religion, in fact, seems to have been already existent before man emerged from the brute stage. It is perhaps fanciful to say so, but we can hardly deny the germs of religion to the animal world. However that may be, this religious material fills so completely the narrow elemental channel of primitive life from which all our civilisation flows, that we may alter a famous phrase and say that, if we except the blind forces of nature, nothing moves in this world of ours that is not religious in its origin."—CRAWLEY, *Tree of Life*, p. 228.

"The whole force of evolution directs our glance forward—χρὴ τέλος ὀρᾶν is its motto. It is only the "dead hand" of the old Deism which makes man still explain things by their first beginnings. Everything *is* that which it may become, not that out of which it came. Its explanation lies neither behind it, as materialism teaches, nor within it, as pantheism would have us believe, but beyond it and above it, is a moral order gathered up into a Moral Being.

'And so the whole round world is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.'"

AUBREY MOORE, *Science and the Faith*, xlvii.

"We are born believing. A man bears beliefs as a tree bears a ples."—EMERSON.

"Children of men! the unseen Power, whose eye
For ever doth accompany mankind,
Hath looked on no religion scornfully
That men did ever find.

Which has not taught weak wills how much they can?
Which has not fallen on the dry heart like rain?
Which has not cried to sunk self-weary man:
Thou must be born again?

Children of men! not that your age excel
In pride of life the ages of your sires,
But that ye think clear, feel deep, bear fruit well,
The Friend of man desires."

MATTHEW ARNOLD, *Progress*.

LECTURE THE FOURTH

"We are born believing," says Emerson; it may, with almost greater truth, be said of the human race that it came into the world religious, and the Christian who believes, with the Psalmist, that man lives under the dominion of a God who is "mindful of him," and with St. Paul, that "God is not far from any one of us," and that "He has not left Himself without witness," for "in Him we live and move and have our being," can well understand how this should be so.

But when we come to study the origin of religion and the dawnings of the religious consciousness in man, we must be prepared to go back to very crude and simple beginnings, and we must not be surprised if we discover some races, at least, which have never attained to the idea of a Supreme Being at all. So large a part does environment play in the development of man's moral and spiritual nature.

In this Lecture I shall approach the subject, about which so much has been written that it seems almost impossible to say anything new, but

which appeals to us from its bearing upon the received Biblical view of the earliest condition of mankind, from the standpoint of the anthropologist and antiquary, and not from that of the theologian. I may be permitted to look at it from the theological side later on.

We have seen "Man" appear on the earth, the last and highest product of the evolutionary process, a creature endowed with reason, conscious of himself, it may have been in the Tertiary, but certainly at least in the Quaternary Epoch. When the truth of this first became apparent, desperate attempts were made, as by Prebendary Reynolds and others, to save the traditional view of the account in Genesis by describing the men of the Stone Age as pre-Adamite, and by imagining some special act of God in the case of "Adam" which started the present human race on its career; and even Dr. Orr makes a similar attempt, by endeavouring to carry back a literal interpretation of Genesis ii. and iii. to the beginnings of our race. But all such attempts must fail from the very nature of the case, and, from the point of view of the historical criticism of the Old Testament, they are as unnecessary as they are vain.

I spoke in the second Lecture of "ontogeny and phylogeny" as running a parallel course in the case of the development of the perfected individual from the germ. This same truth holds good in the case

of the individual human being and the race, and we shall consider in our last Lecture the bearing which this has upon the doctrine of sin.

As the individual human being advances from childhood to youth and from youth to maturity, so the race has advanced from the non-moral, and, if we may say so, childish innocence of its early condition to the maturity of its present-day civilisation in the case of its highest representatives; and along with growing civilisation and complexity of life has come a growing sense of failure, of shortcoming, of sin; thus the Ages of Stone, Bronze, and Iron represent in more senses than one "stages of culture." Moreover, just as there are certain stunted individuals who never leave their childhood behind them, so there are certain stunted races who have never advanced beyond childhood, so to say, in religious or in any other ideas, by studying whom we may hope to arrive at some notion of man's earliest religious condition, and to trace the faltering steps by which he was led, in the case of one chosen people, along the path that led to Christianity.

Leaving on one side, as undiscoverable, the question as to whether Eolithic man, if such a being existed, had any religious ideas at all, or whether he was not rather in the absolute unconsciousness of earliest childhood, the problem as to the religious ideas of our earliest known ancestor, Palæolithic man, meets us on the threshold. His

only modern representatives, the Tasmanians, have died out, while the Esquimaux have been for too long under the influence of missionaries for it to be possible to discover anything as to their primitive notions.

We know that ideas which must have their origin in the very childhood of the race, and which must be rooted in feelings derived from our animal ancestry and unconsciously remembered, are found to-day among savage peoples, and surviving as "superstitions" among ourselves, and these will come up for notice when we discuss the religious ideas of Neolithic man. Of Palæolithic man we have too few remains extant to be able to judge with what rites, if any, he buried his dead, and his tools and weapons tell us nothing of his religious condition. We only know that he was a hunter, living by the produce of the chase and of fishing, and that thus he must have been struck with the sublimity and grandeur of Nature as he was overtaken by the thunderstorm in the heart of the "forest primeval" or on the mountain-side, and no doubt also by her gentler aspects in the beauty of the sunset and the dawn, and these must have left indelible impressions on his mind; we know also that he was an artist. Among the specimens of his art are those drawings of the mammoth, reindeer, ibex, horse, etc., rendered with a freedom and skill which testify to a high artistic

capacity, as was shown in the last Lecture. These are executed on mammoth tusks, reindeer antlers, and other objects. Among the most spirited are the mammoth on a portion of the animal's tusk from the cave of La Madeleine, Dordogne, a replica of which is in the British Museum; reindeer feeding from the grotto of Thayngen, Schaffhausen; and a remarkable group from Les Eyzies, Dordogne, representing an eel or serpent between fishes, with two horses' heads, and between them the earliest known representation of a man, a nude individual brandishing a spear. There is also the solitary specimen of his art, a horse's head, from the Robin Hood Cave, Derbyshire, which proves that Palæolithic man in the caves in what is now Britain possessed the same artistic capabilities as his fellows in the Dordogne. In addition to these drawings, there are others executed on the rock-surface of some of the walls in the very darkest recesses of the caverns, which can only be seen by the aid of artificial light, and which are quite equal to these in their technique. *How* they were ever done is a mystery, but that they were done with some object is certain; for it is an axiom in Anthropology, that primitive man does not give himself trouble merely for an æsthetic purpose, but always with some practical object in view, and it may therefore be argued with great plausibility that all these drawings testify to a religious instinct, and were done

with some definite purpose, the exact import of which it is now impossible to determine.[1]

When we pass on to consider the religious ideas of Neolithic man, we find ourselves in a region in which help may be obtained from those of modern savage races, whom I have described as being in a state of stunted childhood, and from the superstitions surviving among the higher races of to-day. This is the region which has been so fully explored in Professor Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, and in Dr. J. G. Frazer's *Golden Bough*, as well as by a large number of modern writers, among whom may be mentioned Mr. A. Lang in *The Making of Religion* and *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, and other works, and Mr. Ernest Crawley in *The Mystic Rose* and *The Tree of Life*, and on which a flood of light has been thrown by the studies of Messrs. Spencer and Gillen, Mr. Howitt, Mr. Fison and others among the Australian natives, Miss Mary Kingsley, Major Leonard, Mr. Dennett, etc., in West Africa, Dr. Oldham and Mr. Crooke in India, and a host of workers elsewhere.[2]

Time was when the school whose greatest representative was Professor Max Müller held the field; the school, namely, of mythologists, who derived all the gods of Greece and Rome, and, behind these, the gods of India, from sky myths, and there is some foundation in truth for the idea; but it is now recognised that the origin of religion and of the

[1] See Note A, p. 164. [2] See Note B, p. 166.

gods must be sought elsewhere, and is much more complex than was supposed.

In passing from Palæolithic to Neolithic man, we pass from a race of hunters and fishermen to a race or races in which agriculture was known, who had begun to till the soil and to domesticate flocks and herds, to use the horse, and to tame the cat and dog.

This must inevitably have produced a totally different outlook upon Nature, and would lead to a familiarity not merely with her sterner and larger aspects, but with her more intimate and gentler moods. The changing seasons, the fruitful rains, the ripening suns, the processes and results of the tillage of the soil, the tending of the flocks and herds, would all have their influence on man's mind and soul. Moreover, as the period advanced men became more and more separated and collected into communities and tribes united by a common bond of totemistic or family relationship, and no longer wandered in small groups as they had done when food was precarious and enemies everywhere to be feared; and thus the foundations of future aggregations of tribes into states were laid. The best examples of such communities are to be found in the earliest Lake-dwellers of Switzerland, though such settlements continued down to the Iron Age, and even into the seventeenth century in Ireland, and continue in Siam to-day. Herodotus well

describes some that existed in his own day. Remains of the Neolithic Age are to be seen in all parts of the world, and indeed it *exists* among the backward races to-day; and if we would understand the religious ideas of Neolithic man as he existed in Europe and Asia thousands of years ago, ideas which yet run powerfully in our own blood, it can only be by studying the ideas of the stunted children of our race still in that stage of culture, as has been done by the writers named above, and thus we shall arrive at some understanding of the way in which, by the providence of God, the Semitic peoples were led to higher and nobler ideas, which culminated in Judaism and Christianity.

"Broadly speaking," says Dr. Saleeby, "there are two theories as to the origin of religion, apart from such effete notions as that the revelation of one God has been granted to all men, and that polytheism and fetishism as seen among the savages of to-day are developed from a primitive monotheism by a process of degeneration."[1] "These two theories," he continues, "are first Animism," and he pushes this contemptuously on one side, "and secondly Ancestor-worship." This latter theory, which was the one favoured by Herbert Spencer, receives the support of the learned author as it did of the late Mr. Grant Allen; but there is really no antagonism between the two theories, and, in my opinion, the

[1] Saleeby, *Evolution the Master Key*, pp. 223 *seq.*

facts derived from a study of modern savages, unknown to Herbert Spencer, and from a study of surviving folklore and superstition among the higher races, are all in favour of according the prime factor in the evolution of religion to that method of looking out upon Nature to which Professor Tylor has given the appropriate name of "Animism."

What is meant by this term? Primitive man, and I am speaking now only of man when he has attained to the Neolithic stage of culture, previous to which he may be described as being in the stage of Naturism, is conscious of himself, and knows that he is *alive*. He looks out upon Nature and sees other creatures, beasts and birds and creeping things, all endowed with a power of volition and of motion, and possessing faculties and necessities like his own,—eating, drinking, propagating their species,—and he knows that they too are *alive*. He looks out on the trees of the forest, and sees them bending beneath the blast of the tempest, or gently murmuring in the evening breeze, putting on foliage and flowers in the springtime and summer, bringing forth fruit in the autumn, and unclothing themselves till nothing is left but bare boughs in the winter; and though they have no volition or motion, he knows that they too are *alive*. He cultivates his crops, and the seed-corn, of which he soon learns to make his bread, tells him that these also grow to maturity by virtue of life. And this faculty of life he passes

on to mountain and plain, to sea and river, to rock and stone, until he lives in the midst of an enchanted world in which everything is alive, and nothing is wonderful, because all is wonderful, and nothing unexpected. Here, too, comes in the greatest wonder of all. Primitive man is neither a materialist nor a pantheist,—his outlook is not broad enough nor deep enough for such an enlarged outlook,—but he is a spiritualist in the correct acceptation of the term. He explains the life that is in everything on the theory of souls. Each and every object and every plant and creature with which he comes in contact is alive by virtue of the soul that it possesses, or rather that possesses it; and this soul is something that is not permanently attached to any particular creature or object, but may transfer itself at will, and hence transformation and interchange of souls become a part of his creed. This is animism, very briefly stated, and it has been well called "the seed of religion," for it lies at the root of all man's religious ideas, of ancestor-worship among the rest, as well as of all that later on developed into sacrifice and sacrament.

Among primitive races we find this associated with the arrangement of society on a basis of totemism and a system of magic, while among higher savages it runs into the system to which has been given the name of fetishism and idolatry.

If we wish to see human society at about as early

a stage as possible, we find it among the natives of Australia. Here we have peoples who, in respect of the "comforts" of life, are in a far more backward condition than were the Neolithic inhabitants of Europe, who yet have developed a most elaborate system of social arrangements and of religion and magic.

As Mr. A. Lang has said: "As far as what we commonly call material civilisation is concerned, the natives of the Australian continent are probably the most backward of mankind, having no agriculture, no domestic animals, and no knowledge of metal-working. Their weapons and implements are of stone, wood, and bone, and they have not even the rudest kind of pottery. But though the natives are all, in their natural state, on or about this common low level, their customary laws, ceremonials, and beliefs are rich in variety."[1]

Their social arrangements depend on a system of marriage rules, and these are based on what is called "totemism." The word is derived from the Red Indians of North America, who possess a similar system, and indeed from indications in the primitive religion of Egypt, among the Semites and Hindus, and from survivals in the folklore of the civilised races, we may argue that this represents the most primitive social arrangement of the human race. The totem is an animal, plant, or insect representing the

[1] Langloh-Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, Introduction, p. xi.

original ancestor of the human being, and this descent is derived in the first instance through the mother, and only as a later development through the father. Every Australian is born into a totem clan, or, as it is termed, phratry, and of these some tribes have two, some four, some eight; no member of a totem clan may marry a member of the same clan, but whereas the rules are simple enough where there are only two divisions, and where descent is reckoned through the mother, they become more and more elaborate as the advance is made to eight divisions, and descent becomes reckoned through the father. The elaboration of rules certainly argues advance, and yet though all the tribes are on the same level of animism, *i.e.*, attribute a living soul to every object, making it to be what it is, we note a curious degradation of religious ideas coincident with the advance in social arrangements. The tribes with eight divisions, such as the Arunta, in the centre of the continent, are entirely without any idea of a Supreme Being; they carry back the origin of things to what they speak of as "the Alcheringa times," the "Alcheringa" being mythical beings who lived on the earth at a time beyond which the mind of the native cannot go, and afterwards some ascended into the sky, and others descended into the earth. But ere they went each deposited a stone or stick bearing mystic signs representative of the totem in a secret place, which

is therefore sacred, in which its spirit was enshrined, and every Arunta child is a re-incarnation of one of these spirits. In the other tribes, every child belongs as a matter of course to the totem clan of its mother or father as the case may be, but among the Arunta and the tribes which share their belief the child belongs to the totem of the district in which it happens to be born, and the first thing to be done is to seek for the "Churinga," the secret and sacred stone or stick whose Alcheringa spirit is re-incarnated in the child, and if it cannot be found then one is fashioned to represent it. The depositaries of these sacred Churinga, called Ertnatulunga, are known to the Wirreenun, or wise men of the tribe, but the spirits themselves are ever waiting and anxious for re-incarnation,—their location is by some sacred tree or spring,—and in consequence unmarried girls or women who do not wish to be mothers will hurry by the spot lest the spirit should enter them. The only idea of the meaning of the intercourse of the sexes which the Arunta have is that it is the preparation of the woman for the entry of the spirit-child who is waiting to be born. Now all this is a highly philosophical and closely reasoned system, and it absolutely dispenses with any need for a belief in a Supreme Being. On the other hand, the tribes which do not share the Arunta belief in re-incarnation, though they mostly have something corresponding to the belief in the

Alcheringa times, do possess a belief in a Supreme Being, and this argues that primitive man, along with his animistic beliefs which led to fetishism and polytheism, also possessed a belief in a high god, which some races have lost, but which in the soil of Israel led to Judaism and Christianity. For instance, the Euahlayi tribe believe in Baiame, and even pray to him; for he is the All-Father, the Creator and upholder of men and all things. Other tribes believe in Daramulun, and even make rude figures of him on the trunks of trees, but these beliefs are kept secret from the women and children, who are not supposed to breathe his name, and are known only to the initiated. It has been argued by some that this belief in the All-Father is derived from missionaries, but on this point Mrs. Langloh-Parker, speaking of the Euahlayi, says: "The nearest missionary settlement was founded after we settled among the Euahlayi, and was distant about one hundred miles"; and Mr. Howitt, speaking of Nurrundere, Nurelli, Koin, Bunjil, Daramulun or Baiame, under all which names the All-Father is known in different tribes, distinctly eliminates all possibility of his derivation from intercourse with missionaries, and shows that he belongs to the inherited stock of beliefs in these tribes, while the very fact that his name is concealed from women and children and from the uninitiated goes to confirm this.

Among the Arunta this belief has been lost, and in none of the tribes is it carried to any practical consequences; but Mr. Howitt is justified in saying, "Although it cannot be alleged that these aborigines have consciously any form of religion,"—religion here meaning "the worship of a Supreme Being,"—"it may be said that their beliefs are such that, under favourable conditions, they might have developed into an actual religion based on the worship of Baiame. There is not any worship of Daramulun, but the dances round the figure of clay and the invocating of his name by the medicine-men certainly might have led up to it.

"If such a change as a recognised religion had ever become possible, I feel that it would have been brought about by those men who are the depositaries of the tribal beliefs, and by whom, in the past, as I think, all the advances in the organisation of their society have been effected. If such a momentous change to the practice of religion had ever occurred, those men would have readily passed from being medicine-men to the office of priests,"[1] and may we not add, of prophets, *i.e.*, inspired teachers, for the antagonism between these is of later growth?

This is exactly what did occur among the higher and more favourably situated races of mankind, and above all among the Semites.

Before we leave Australia, we may just note the

[1] Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-east Australia*, pp. 499–508, *et passim*.

Euahlayi belief as to souls, which is also found among the other tribes, because it will meet us again in West Africa. Everything that is has its soul, but man has more than one; and it is this belief in the multiplicity of souls, so to say, that leads to the belief in the deified ancestor which we see flourishing everywhere in ancient religion, and so to the evolution of the idea of the high god, Baiame, Daramulun, or whatever his name may be.

Thus the belief in a "high god" or gods is in its essence the offspring of animism, for when he is analysed he is discovered to be a supra-normal human being, who is, in fact, though the connection has in many cases been lost, the deified ancestor of the race. He is everlasting, for he existed from the beginning of all things, and he still lives. But in being so he is merely in that state which primitive man believes everyone would be in if not prematurely killed by evil magic.

But in Australia, as in West Africa and elsewhere, this high god is practically of no consequence, for he is far removed from human affairs, and cares little or nothing for his subjects, like the *fainéant* kings of the Merovingian line in France. It is much more important to be able to enter into rapport with and to control the spirits that animate and rule all nature, including man, and this is done through the agency of the medicine-men and by the exercise of magic, sympathetic and otherwise.

Magic has been well defined as the "science of primitive man." He sees that certain effects follow certain causes, and he argues that the wise men, originally the elders, then a certain class of the initiated, will be able to produce similar results in a sphere beyond his ordinary control. Hence arises the power of the magician, the machinery of witchcraft, and later on, among more advanced races, the institution of priesthood and sacrifice, and later still, as the final development of sympathetic magic, the efficacy of sacrament.

In these Lectures we are only able to take a broad survey over a vast subject. More detailed information and the working out of our arguments must be sought in the books mentioned in the Bibliography attached. We have seen that primitive man, finding himself in a world in which his existence can only be maintained by struggle, in which light and darkness, pain and pleasure, are strangely intermingled, explains the position on the theory that everything possesses life, and that life is due to the animating soul or spirit of the object. Sun, moon, and stars, earth, water, air, rocks, stones, and trees, are all the abode of spirits who are favourable to him or the reverse according as he learns to control them to his purpose by his magic, and he lives in an enchanted world in which all things are possible to him that believes. What civilised man calls "miracles" are no miracles at

all, for they are the natural outcome of his view of the world ; and that rocks and stones and trees and beasts and birds should converse together and with him is no marvel, but just as natural as that he himself should have the power of speech, for are they not animated by the very same life-powers or souls that animate himself?

This is the origin of all that, later on, developed into the polytheism of Egyptians, and Semites, and the classic mythology of Greece and Rome, and survives in the sacred trees, and wells, and stones of European folklore. This is the origin also of idolatry, for the spirit that animates an object can be transferred by sympathetic magic to its image, which therefore can be rendered favourable by propitiatory worship, or coerced into becoming so by magic.

We have seen that the simplest expression of the ideas of primitive man is to be found in those stunted children of our race, the natives of Australia. An advance forward is found among the natives of Africa, whose system of fetishism and magic, as described by Miss M. Kingsley and other travellers, gives us the truest picture to be obtained in the present day of what must have been the condition of our Neolithic ancestors in Europe.

Their monuments are found all along the line of their westward march from the plains of Asia, through Syria and Northern Africa, to Western

Spain and France and the British Isles, in the menhirs, or sacred standing stones, the dolmens, and the long barrows, as well as in the great temples which they erected at Avebury, Stonehenge, and Carnac. That their system of social arrangements was totemistic is proved by the cup and ring marked rocks, and the spiral or circular engravings, as well as others, such as, in some localities, representations of footprints, which may have been those of "Alcheringa" ancestors, which everywhere mark their course.

They were more advanced in their religious ideas, and became more and more so as time went on, under more favourable conditions, than the Australians, or West Africans, or other modern primitive races have ever become, but the essentials of their religious and magical ideas were precisely the same, and were rooted in animism. The menhir was the shrine of a spirit, the sacred tree was its abode; the dolmen, fashioned in the likeness of the earthly abode of the living, and in many cases that very abode itself, enshrined the spirit of the departed chief or ancestor to whom worship was paid. The "temples," so called, as at Stonehenge, Avebury, or Carnac, in Brittany, which are the primeval models of the Egyptian Karnak, of the Mycenean Baitylon, of the Parthenon, of Baalbec, and of the medieval cathedral in all its glory, were for the worship of the mighty Sun, the lord and life-giver to all things,

even to "breeding maggots in a dead dog, being a god kissing carrion," as Hamlet says; but the line of evolution led them, as it did most races, to polytheism, and it was only through contact with Israel in far later times that the European races reached the notion of the one high God, the All-Father, which the poor aborigines of Australia have reached unaided, and in some cases cast off; but which Israel attained as the result of the teaching of the later prophets inspired to a unique, and by other races unattainable, degree by the same Spirit who has watched over and guided the whole development of mankind.

The folklore of Europe to-day enshrines countless precious relics, like flies in amber, of the old Neolithic animistic ideas, and in numerous instances these early beliefs were taken up and consecrated by the Church; or, as in the case of magic and witchcraft, were sanctioned with terrible results, and have thus been preserved to our day. Here it may be permitted to notice a point in which I am compelled to differ from the late Mr. Grant Allen. That talented and gifted writer, in his comments on the *Attis* of Catullus, of which he has given a most beautiful rendering in English, is inclined to derive the worship of trees from ancestor-worship, and supports his argument by a reference to the fact that on the summit of most, if not all, of the Neolithic long barrows there grows a clump of trees.

These, he says, were understood to enshrine the spirit of the chief or great man buried beneath, and thus themselves became objects of worship, which was afterwards extended to other sacred trees.[1] This, I am persuaded, is an inadequate and unnecessary explanation. The two things are quite distinct, but both are a natural and necessary outcome of the animistic view of Nature. Trees are worshipped because, like all the rest of man's surroundings, they are alive; their voice, or the voice of the enshrined spirit, breathes in the evening zephyrs, or howls in the wintry gales, and for example, as a matter of induction from known facts, all the great gods and goddesses of Greece and Rome were tree-spirits before they were admitted to the mythological pantheon. The ancestor or great man, chief or medicine-man, is worshipped because he is still alive, and powerful as in life.[2] His spirit visits his descendant or his worshipper in dreams, and the hierophant knows that there is no such thing as death. What seems death is only a transference of

[1] Grant Allen, *The Attis of Catullus*, pp. 31 *seq.* See "Tree and Pillar Worship," by the Author, *Transactions R.S.L.*, vol. xxiv.

[2] Natural death is an idea inconceivable to the Australian. When a man dies it is because "evil magic" has been put upon him, and the doer must be sought and slain. The Australian is in the same stage of culture as Wordsworth's "Little Maid," of whom he says—

> "A simple child,
> That lightly draws its breath,
> And feels its life in every limb,
> What can it know of death?"

life to another sphere, where the influence of the seeming dead is more powerful and more capable of being favourably invoked than ever it was in life. The spirits of the departed still take an interest in, and still influence the things and people they cared for in life.

According to the beautiful Indian expression of the thought,

> "The hunter still the deer pursues,
> The hunter and the deer a shade;"

and the man who was great and powerful in life can by worship and the exercise of sympathetic magic be induced to use his power and impart his strength to his worshipper.

It was stated above that both sacrifice and sacrament have their root in animism, and derive their potency from the notion of sympathetic magic.

The essence of sacrifice, as of sacrament, is communion, and we shall note, later on, the bearings of this upon the sacrifices of the ancient world, and upon the sacraments of the Church.

The communion is the partaking of, the sharing in, the communication of life, and of all that life implies.

The Australian, the West African, the Fijian, to-day, like our primitive ancestors, believes that by eating an object he becomes possessed of its inherent vital powers.

There is no such thing as actual priest or

sacrifice among the Australians, but he will eat his totem animal, plant, or insect on ceremonial occasions, that he may share its life. The Fijian ate his fallen foe that he might gain his strength. The West African eats of that which he offers in sacrifice to his fetish for the same purpose. The essence of sacrifice lies not so much in the slaying or the offering of the victim,—this is a much later idea,—as in the eating of it, by which its life and all that that carries with it becomes absorbed in, and a part of the very being of, the offerer. But by the time we can allow ourselves to speak of "offerer" and "victim" we have already arrived at a later strain of ideas; in the earlier times, as among the Australians to-day, it is the totem, or, among other races, the spirit of the slain object, and later, the god himself, with whom man enters into communion through eating, and this idea persists and is turned to purely spiritual ends in the Christian Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. Thus the most primitive intuitions of early man find their fulfilment and highest realisation in the most sacred mysteries of the Christian faith, although these include also all the deeper and more profound ideas which sprang in later ages from the sense of sin and the need of propitiation.[1]

Another method by which early man wrought to bring himself *en rapport* with the spirit in sacred

[1] See Note C, p. 167.

tree or stone or spring was that which has been mentioned under the name of "sympathetic magic." This is so called in contrast with ordinary magic and witchcraft.

By means of these latter maleficent spirits could be controlled and counteracted, the machinations of enemies defeated, death dealt on a foe, and all the complicated machinery of man's struggle with Nature and with his kind turned to useful purpose; but sympathetic magic makes use of beneficent spirits and the kindly forces of Nature, and turns *these* to useful purpose.

The very idea of communion through eating is itself a sort of sympathetic magic; but when, as in European folklore and folk-customs, we find sacred trees and stones and wells adorned with rags or other articles from the body of the devotee, or when a sacred stone is smeared with oil, we know that the old idea is at work, and that this is done not with the notion of propitiation or worship, but that the life that is in the sacred object may become a part of the life of the offerer, and that thus he may share in the beneficent influences which that life has to bestow.[1]

[1] In Ireland, sacred trees are met with in many localities, and are of a variety of species. The mountain-ash is popularly supposed in that country to have a peculiar virtue against the attacks of witches, fairies, or malign influences generally. When the dairymaid churns for a long time without making butter, she will stir the cream with a sprig of rowan, and strike the cow with another, thus breaking the spell. The ancient Irish believed that the first man sprang from the

Our holy wells, and gospel oaks, and holed stones with all their mystic rites testify to the survival of man's earliest ideas down to this twentieth century, and they meet us on the threshold of the Christian religion when "virtue" went out of our Lord at the touch of the poor diseased woman on the hem of His garment, and when "handkerchiefs and aprons" were brought to the sick from the body of St. Paul and healed them, and when the very shadow of St. Peter passing by imparted healing to the sick. This last is a very striking instance of the survival of primitive ideas, for in the thought of early man the shadow is a part of himself. Indeed, it is one of his souls, and possesses all the potency that is in himself. For, unlike other objects, man has three or sometimes four souls.

This is the case among the Euahlayi, and among some of the West African natives, and represents a very early strain of primitive thought. There is

alder, the first woman from a mountain-ash. Both trees are still believed to be endowed with mystic properties. On May Eve, withes made of the branches of the mountain-ash are tied round the horns of cows; temporary hoops, formed in the same way, are placed round churns, to counteract the spells of the fairies, always busily engaged on May morning trying to steal the butter of the farmers. Articles from the person, pieces of rag or other things, are hung on the boughs of the sacred tree or dropped into the waters of the sacred well to bring the devotee *en rapport* with the *numen*, nowadays some saint, whose presence makes the place sacred. Sacred trees may not be cut down, for that would be to destroy or scare away the consecrating presence. (Wood-Martin, *Traces of the Elder Faiths of Ireland*, vol. ii. pp. 114, 152–157.)

the soul proper, which animates the living man; the dream soul, which is wakeful while he sleeps, and journeys far off holding communion with the departed and the unseen, but always returns when he awakes, for if it does not he never wakes again; the shadow soul, which always accompanies him, and which must not be injured unless you wish to injure the man himself, for it possesses all the virtue that is in him—hence the Irish expression, "May your shadow never grow less;"[1] and the animal soul—*i.e.*, that which regulates the animal and physical functions of the body.

Now, all these primitive ideas which are dealt with in this Lecture, and which survive as present-day beliefs among savages and in the folklore of the European races, are found in the sacred literature of Israel, and are themselves, accordingly, eloquent witnesses against the traditional view of that literature, and in favour of the view which holds to the long evolution of our race in the sphere of religion and morals no less than in that of the evolution of our physical and mental being.

As Mr. Howitt says, speaking of the source of the Australian ideas as to dreams, "How far back in man's mental evolution this may be I am not prepared to suggest;" but when some scholars speak of the "Bible and Babylon," and derive the origin

[1] Compare De la Motte Fouqué's wonderful story of *The Shadowless Man*.

of all the religious ideas found in the Bible from Babylon, I would answer that it is necessary to go much farther back into the past than that, and to seek the origin of the religious ideas of Israel and Babylon alike in the primitive ideas of our race.

At the very beginning of the Bible, following immediately the philosophical introduction in the first chapter, stands the earliest Hebrew story of the origin of things (as will appear in our next Lecture), and at the very outset there is a hint of totemism in the fact that the animals are brought to Adam "to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living thing that was the name thereof." Then in the garden whence man first looks out upon the world there are the two sacred trees, "the tree of life" and "the tree of knowledge of good and evil," of which the former probably belongs to the original story, while the latter is a later addition. The Tree of Life is the "Living Tree" *par excellence*; the tree whose indwelling spirit is specially powerful and beneficent, by partaking of which man shall be rendered immortal; the tree which recurs in every mythology, and is everywhere a witness to primitive thought. Following on this we have the story of the speaking serpent, whose subtlety exceeds that of every beast of the field; and finally the beautiful touch in which the sighing of the trees of the garden in the evening breeze is to the guilty pair as the

voice of Yahweh Elohim walking in the garden in the cool of the day.

Again, the name "Elohim," which in later times signified the one eternal God of the whole universe, and is so used in the first chapter, and indeed, with few exceptions, wherever it occurs in the Old Testament, carries us back to those primitive and far-away pre-Babylonian times when the ancestors of Israel were in the animistic stage of religion; for what are the "Elohim" but the spirits which animate all things, and through whom all things live? In a few cases, as I have hinted, the plural "Elohim" is used in later times for the "gods" of the heathen, or even applied to the rulers of the people, and in early times "Yahweh Elohim" may have signified that the national "high god" Yahweh was lord of the "Elohim," but the phrase very soon cystallised in Hebrew theology, and "Yahweh Elohim" came to signify God in His covenant relationship with Israel, and is very properly rendered the "LORD God." Then there is the remarkable fact that the turning-points or crises in the lives of the Patriarchs are all associated with sacred trees and wells and stones—Abraham with trees, Isaac with wells, and Jacob with stones; and at these sacred spots they build altars, and worship the god to whom the place belongs. (Of course in all the stories, as they have come down to us, the monotheistic editor has been at work.)

Jacob not only has a dream at Bethel, induced by the spirit inhabiting the sacred stone which he had inadvertently taken for his pillow, in which the "God of Bethel" speaks to him on his setting out on his journey to Padan Aram, but he sets it up for a pillar, *i.e.*, he restores it to the position it had occupied in the circle of sacred stones, and anoints it with oil, a refinement on the more ancient custom of smearing the stone with the fat of a slain beast, and thus brings himself *en rapport* with and in the communion of a common life with the god or spirit belonging to it. Furthermore, in the account by another hand of his return journey, he again stops at Bethel and sets up a pillar, which he again anoints, and pours a libation over it.

Moses has a communication from God out of a bush which burns with fire but is not consumed; Joshua sets up twelve sacred stones in the midst of Jordan; and who does not remember the beautiful Song of the Well in Numbers xxi. 17, 18? David takes the swaying of the mulberry branches in the wind as the signal of the presence of the LORD and the pledge that He would give him the victory, but "the Lord" is the later rendering of the tree-spirit. Every altar in old Israel was erected on a "high place," *i.e.*, originally on some Neolithic long barrow on a hilltop, surmounted by its grove of sacred trees, and with its Asherah, or sacred post, and its Matzebah, or sacred monolith, beside it. Solomon erected the

twin pillars, Jachin and Boaz, in front of the Temple at Jerusalem, just as Hiram did before the temple of Baal or Melcarth at Tyre, and as the Myceneans erected the sacred post before the house of the god of the Double Axe.

The consultation of Yahweh by means of the Urim and Thummim was a piece of pure magic. The earlier companies of the "sons of the prophets" were just Hebrew *Wirreenun*, or medicine-men, as David himself was when he charmed the evil spirit from Saul by the music of his harp. Witchcraft and wizardry still lingered on; Saul consulted the Witch of Endor, although in obedience to an earlier law he had sought out and destroyed all the witches he could find, and she, by her magic arts, brings Samuel from the grave to pronounce Saul's doom.[1]

The story of Balaam again introduces us to the speaking ass; and when Sisera fought against Israel, the stars in their courses, or the spirits inhabiting and animating them, fought against him. And finally, that Israel had passed through the totemistic stage of society is seen in the number of names taken from beasts and plants which are found persisting to historic times, and which represent the old totem clans, as well as in the law of the levirate, and the prohibition of certain classes of food; and both Jeremiah and the 2nd Isaiah testify to the still abiding tendencies which had

[1] See Note D, p. 170.

their root in totemism, while the prohibition of tattooing, *i.e.* the marking themselves with the totem crest, points in the same direction.[1]

All these instances, and they might be multiplied, are, every one of them singly (and their force is multiplied tenfold by their abundance, and when they are regarded in their totality), as was said above, eloquent witnesses to the fact that the ancestors of the Israelites had passed through the very same phases of animistic belief which characterise modern savage peoples who have never emerged out of animism, and which survived among them as they survive in the folklore and folk-customs of the cultured races to-day.

How far they were still living beliefs, even in the time of the Patriarchs, or rather in the days to which the original stories belong, is a moot question; but all the stories and the whole history have, as we shall see, undergone thorough editorial revision in a monotheistic sense ere they came down to us, and we may be grateful that so much remains, as it does also in European folklore, to testify to the early condition of our race.

Further light will be thrown on the subject as we proceed to study the documents in which these ancient beliefs are enshrined, and to trace the upward progress of Israel till she became the bearer to mankind of a world-religion, and the means whereby

[1] Jacobs, *Biblical Archæology*, pp. 64–103. Isa. lxv. 3–6, lxvi. 3.

God unfolded His purposes for our race; but enough has been said to show that in her earlier stages Israel differed in no wise from the rest of mankind, and her inspiration and the revelation of which she was the bearer is no longer to be sought by taking literally the story she tells, nor by setting her apart in her beginnings, and differentiating her from the rest of mankind as having retained a primeval revelation which all the other races of men have lost, but by marking her providential guidance and her unique history, through which she was led by the hand of God to a more rapid progress and a more vivid apprehension of the divine than the rest of mankind were permitted to attain.

NOTE A, p. 138.

"The masterpiece of this phase of art is perhaps the group of reindeer engraved on an antler discovered in the cave of Lorthet (H. Pyrénées). First we see the hind feet of a reindeer which is galloping away. Next comes another galloping reindeer in an attitude first revealed to us in modern times by instantaneous photography as applied to the analysis of rapid movement. An artist of our own day, Aimé Morot, first made use of the knowledge gleaned from photographs and reproduced this action in his horses. It was unknown to all the artists of intermediate ages. The second reindeer is followed by a doe, turning her

head to bell and call her fawn; her action again is like that of the deer in front of her. Between the animals, the artist drew some salmon, as if to fill up the empty spaces; above the last reindeer he placed two pointed lozenges. It has been suggested that these constitute a signature. But what is the meaning of the salmon? This association of the great river-fish with the reindeer is doubtless due to some religious idea; the artist combined the two species which formed the principal nourishment of his tribe or clan. It is, in fact, to be noted that all the animals represented by quaternary art are of the comestible kinds, which savages engraved or painted in order to attract them by a sort of magic sympathy. Civilised man makes hyperbolic use of the expression 'the magic of art.' The primitives actually believed in it. . . .

"Among all these surprising discoveries, this seems to be the most amazing! These paintings, consisting sometimes of over a hundred animals of large dimensions, could only have been executed and were only visible by artificial light! Why, then, did their authors take the trouble to execute them? Was it only to please the eye of the reindeer hunter, when, retiring to his cavern at nightfall, he made his evening meal on the spoils of the chase, by the dim light of smoking lamps filled with oil from the fat of deer? It is impossible to accept such an hypothesis. I have already spoken of the magic element in the works of art, carved, engraved, or painted by primitive man. They show us the first steps of

humanity in the path which led to the worship of animals (as in Egypt), then to that of idols in human shape (as in Greece), and finally, to that of divinity as a purely spiritual conception. The study of the birth of religion is interwoven with that of the origin of art. Born simultaneously, art and religion were closely connected for long ages; their affinity is still evident enough to the thinking mind."[1]

NOTE B, p. 138.

"Apart from diversity of race, manners, and language, we find that along almost any section of Africa from coast to centre, *the farther the traveller advances into the interior, the better is the condition of the natives found to be.*

"These various interior natives, in their normal condition, I would describe as infantile. In confidence and suspicion, in easy anger and easy reconciliation, in rapid demoralisation under evil influences, in undeveloped intellect, in unenlightened spiritual instincts, run into fetishism—in unknown yet assuredly existing possibilities for good, they are essentially children. They are adult neither in wisdom nor in wickedness, *but will become so as they are trained.* They live in families—the family tie and rights of property are respected. . . . Isolated for thousands of years, their life can hardly be called evil or degraded. Among them, both pastoral and agricultural, are to be found germs of

[1] M. Sal. Reinach, *The Story of Art throughout the Ages*, pp. 5, 6.

all the useful arts—metal working, pottery making, spinning, weaving, etc. etc.

. . . . . .

"In the fetichism of the Africans we may see the childlike outcome of an instinctive spiritual belief, rarely presenting any opposition or great difficulty to Christian teaching, which indeed, intelligently presented, comes to them as a revelation of the God they have already been ignorantly worshipping or seeking after."[1]

NOTE C, p. 155.

As Mr. Crawley says:[2]—

"The life of the savage can hardly be said to have any other sphere than the elemental; his rudimentary culture is almost entirely bounded by the elemental facts of existence.

"Let us now compare the case of the civilised religious man. His religion does not enter into his professional or social hours—his life is in two parts—but that with which religion is concerned is the elemental. This fact explains the general truth that the more primitive stages of culture are more religious than the later.

"We may therefore narrow our search by confining it to this sphere, and by looking for the source of religion in the elemental material variously sanctified under the names of religion and magic,

[1] *Tanganyika*, Ed. Coode Hore, Stamford 1892. (The author travelled in the years 1877–79, 1880, *seq.*)

[2] Crawley, *Tree of Life*, pp. 205–224.

superstition, animism, and taboo. . . . Religion is the expression of something so obvious, so universal, and so permanent, that it is one of the last things to be recognised by man, like gravitation or the atmosphere.

"The elemental facts of life are 'secret' and therefore 'sacred'—as is seen in the 'Churingas' mentioned above—and in all the ceremonialism of the Australians." Various illustrations are given by the author, and may be found in his book.

"It seems," he continues, "that there is only one hypothesis which avails to colligate these and similar applications of sacredness to elemental crises. All these phenomena are concerned with one fundamental fact, and this is—*Life*. Throughout primitive habit it is the fundamental processes of organic life that are invariably the subject first of secrecy and then of consecration. . . .

"Life then, we may take it, is the key to our problem. The vital instinct, the feeling of life, the will to life, the instinct to preserve it, is the source of, or rather is identical with, the religious impulse, and is the origin of religion. . . . Sacredness is the result of the religious impulse; the feeling of life is the cause." This is noticeable in regard to all the great crises of life—childbirth, the churching of women, marriage, puberty, initiation ceremonies, confirmation, eating and drinking, and such like.

"The sacramental idea is a special application of the principle of religious sacredness. When human instincts crystallise into sacraments, religion is be-

coming codified, but the original intention of acquiring or transmitting life and health and strength is still present and often still explicit. It is not the spirit of the corn and vine as such, but the life-giving virtue of bread and wine that is the essence of the sacrament. On the lowest plane, food is sacred because the vital instinct affirms its importance; on a higher plane, the meaning is still the essence of life, eternal life with a risen body hereafter, and now grace and strength in a purified body, and the virtue proceeds from the body of Christ. To eat the flesh of the Son of God and to drink His blood gives eternal life." This cannot be better expressed, except that in all *sacramental* observances there is contained also the idea of communion—the communication of higher life to the worshipper on the part of the worshipped, whether it be by water, or the laying on of hands, or the partaking of a common meal. The god and his worshipper meet in "communion" and share a common life. This idea of primitive man the Christian Church has taken up and consecrated to the highest uses.[1]

[1] For the statements in the text as to the beliefs of the Arunta and other tribes of Central Australia, see Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 52, 123–125, 126, 132 *seq.*, 265, 335–338; and the same authors, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 145, 147–151, 155 *seq.*, 161 *seq.*, 169 *seq.*, 173–176, 330, 606. For the beliefs of the Euahlayi, see Mrs. Langloh-Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, pp. 2, 5, 35 *seq.*; for the West Africans, see Miss M. Kingsley, *West African Studies*, pp. 95–186, especially 169–177.

NOTE D, p. 162.

"The Hebrew prophets were believed to be temporarily possessed and inspired by a divine spirit who spoke through them, just as a divine spirit is supposed by West African negroes to speak through the mouth of the dedicated men his priests. Indeed, the points of resemblance between the prophets of Israel and West Africans are close and curious. Like their black brothers, the Hebrew prophets employed music in order to bring on the prophetic trance;[1] like them, they received the divine spirit through the application of a magic oil to their heads;[2] like them, they were consulted not merely in great national emergencies, but in the ordinary affairs of everyday life. Indeed, we learn that the old name for a prophet was a seer,[3] a word which implies that his special function was divination rather than prophecy in the sense of prediction. Be that as it may, prophecy of the Hebrew type has not been limited to Israel; it is indeed a phenomenon of almost world-wide occurrence." (See below, Lecture VI.) "What does distinguish Hebrew prophecy from all others is that the genius of a few members of the profession wrested this vulgar but powerful instrument from baser uses, and by wielding it in the interests of a high morality rendered a service of incalculable value to humanity. This is the glory of Israel."—Dr. J. G. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, pp. 66, 67, and cf. pp. 45–47.

[1] 1 Sam. x. 5, xvi. 23, etc. [2] 1 Kings xix. 16; Isa. lx. 1.
[3] 1 Sam. ix. 9.

LECTURE THE FIFTH

THE RELIGION OF OLD ISRAEL

"For rigorous teachers seized my youth,
And purged its faith and trimmed its fire,
Showed me the high, white star of truth,
There bade me gaze and there aspire.
Even now their whispers pierce the gloom:
What dost thou in this living tomb?

. . . . .

Wandering between two worlds, one dead,
The other powerless to be born,
With nowhere yet to rest my head,
Like thee, on earth I wait forlorn.
Their faith, my tears, the world deride,—
I come to shed them at their side.

. . . . .

For the world cries your faith is now
But a dead time's exploded dream;
My melancholy, sciolists say,
Is a past mode, an outworn theme—
As if the world had ever had
A faith, or sciolists been sad!

. . . . .

Years hence, perhaps, may dawn an age,
More fortunate, alas! than we,
Which without hardness will be sage,
And gay without frivolity.
Sons of the world, oh, speed those years;
But while we wait, allow our tears!"

MATTHEW ARNOLD, *Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse.*

"Again and again I have been haunted and almost checked by the misgiving: What you are saying is true. But in presenting the truth as a truth, are you not imperilling its beauty? Are you not making it less lovable even while you are insisting on its claims to be loved?"—DR. BUTLER, Cambridge Theological Essays, *The Christian Ideal and Christian Hope.*

"It needs no prophet to foresee that the time will come when ideas, which to-day are strange and unwelcome, will be seen to possess a beauty of their own, to be necessary to the completeness of truth, and to belong, no less than many which are long familiar, to the common treasury of the kingdom of God."—DR. SWETE, Cambridge Theological Essays.

"Be ye wise money-changers."

LECTURE THE FIFTH

In one of His most pregnant sayings our Lord enunciates a principle which is eternally true, and one which, notwithstanding, is ever being lost sight of or forgotten. He plainly tells the "scribes and Pharisees," the representatives of all that was authoritative in His day in the religion of Israel, that they were really the representatives of a "creed outworn," that the time had come for a further revelation of God, of which He was the bearer, and that it would be a hopeless task to attempt to "sew the new cloth" of the message He had come to bring on to the "old garment" of Judaism, or to "pour the new wine" of His religion into the ancient and dried-up leathern wine-skins of the ritual and ceremonial of the Law. There must be a departure wholly new: the new cloth must be fashioned into a new garment; the new wine must be poured into new bottles—or, to use a more modern phrase, the new organism, though bearing with it the unmistakable traces of its origin through heredity, must also inevitably fashion for itself, and be modified by, a new environment (Mark ii. 21, 22).

The primitive apostles were slow to learn this lesson, and made heroic efforts to adapt the new religion of Christ to the old environment of the Temple. It was not until the labours of St. Paul were justified by the destruction of Jerusalem, and the ancient fabric of Judaism collapsed in dust and ashes, that the final break was made, and Christianity started on its career of conquest as a world-religion. No sooner, however, was her position established than the old fatal tendency reasserted itself, and "the Church," having formulated her creeds and dogmas, and fixed the main line of her ceremonial and ritual practice, settled down in the comfortable assurance that the "truth" had been once for all expressed, and that nothing remained for mankind to do save to accept that which was already determined. As long as the boundaries of knowledge remained circumscribed within the narrow limits of the pre-scientific era, this fixation of belief was not perhaps of so much consequence, although in every age there could be found those who refused to be bound by the dogmatic utterances of the past, and from time to time the door which it was supposed had been closed was pushed ajar, only to be fast shut again.

At last, with the great awakening of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, of which the Renaissance formed the literary and, so to say, scientific side, and the Reformation the religious

side, the door received a push which none of the forces of reaction have since been able to counteract, and the mind of man, emancipated from the leading-strings of a thousand years, refused any longer to be bound, and commenced that onward march in the search for truth in which it is our privilege and our duty to take our part.

This applies to the view we take of the books which contain the Hebrew and Christian revelation equally with any other products of human intelligence, and it is becoming more and more widely recognised under the stress of present-day problems. Fortunately, neither the undivided Church, nor the later Church in any of her subdivisions, neither the Orthodox Greek, nor the unchanging Roman, nor the dignified Anglican, whether in Synod or Formularies or Articles, has ever laid down a hard and fast decision as to what constitutes the inspiration of the Bible, or wherein the revelation consists, and thus no student who brings the currents of modern thought to bear upon the ancient Scriptures need fear that he is going counter to any opinions or dogmas to which he may be supposed to have given his allegiance by the fact of his adhesion to the Church. "We have this treasure in earthen vessels," said St. Paul, speaking indeed of the frail and perishing "vessel" of the body which enshrines the spirit of the Christian teacher and dispenser of the gospel "treasure"; but the saying is equally true

of the human documents which convey the revelation of God to man. And it is the part of wisdom that this should be recognised before the new wine of modern discoveries of God's methods has rent the old wine-skins, withered and shrunken with the use of a hundred generations, and before the new effervescence of the Divine Spirit, bearing not a new but a somewhat altered gospel, has shattered the earthen vessels made thin and worn by time. To drop the metaphor, the wise will welcome every means whereby the undoubted truths of the antiquity of man and the origin and course of his existence upon earth can be shown not to clash with any but preconceived notions and long inherited opinions of what has been supposed to be the teaching of revelation on these subjects.

And the means which appears to provide a golden bridge on which science and revelation may meet and clasp hands is that which is opened by what is known as the historical, or, to use a phrase which is much misunderstood and therefore, perhaps, feared, the Higher Criticism of the Old and New Testaments.

This word "Higher," as I have pointed out in a pamphlet which I have ventured to reprint, as an Appendix to these Lectures, implies no proud or superior standpoint. It is simply so called because, in contrast with the "Lower" Criticism, which deals with the differences of readings in different versions

and manuscripts, its sphere is found in the endeavour to discover the source and origin of the documents which underlie many of the books which the labour of a vast army of students has proved to be unmistakably composite, and to assign them to their correct age and place in the history of Israel, while at the same time viewing them in the light of the meaning which they originally possessed for their first writers and readers or hearers. The process consists in the endeavour to view them in their historical setting; it is historical acumen that is needed for their unravelling and deciphering; and thus the name "Historical" Criticism may be used with equal justice to describe it, as being at once truer and less obnoxious than that of the Higher Criticism, to which some object.

I have only mentioned the New Testament *par parenthèse* above, as it will not come within our purview, except incidentally, in this series of Lectures; our interest is centred more particularly in the historical portions of the Old Testament, *i.e.*, the Hexateuch, Judges, Samuel, Kings and Chronicles, and a comparison of these with the views of the Prophets and Psalmists of Israel.

After all, the science of historical criticism is, in one sense, no new thing—it is as old as the scribes, who taught that not the literal meaning of the stories or events of the Old Testament was what mattered, but the allegorical or mystical teaching

conveyed. St. Paul, who held that "the letter killeth, the spirit giveth life," was a master of this method, as may be seen in numerous passages of his writings, *e.g.* 1 Cor. x. and Gal. iv. Origen, one of the greatest of the Church Fathers, was also a master of this method, and laid down the principle that all Scripture was to be read in three senses—the literal, which was the least important; the allegorical; and the mystical or spiritual, which latter was that which alone really mattered for Christians.

Our own Church merely asserts that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be received in any commonwealth," and this article was really directed by the Reformers against the *doctrina Romanensium*, that tradition was of equal authority with Scripture.

Of course, as long as it was possible to take the early narratives of Genesis at all in their literal meaning, the matter was not of such vital importance as it has now become. If the world was made in six days about six thousand years ago, and if Adam was the first man, and the events recorded of him and his immediate successors really took place, it mattered not whether Moses was the author of the Pentateuch as it stands, whether immediately through inspiration or mediately through earlier documents, except from a literary point of view, and it was possible to

picture the story of Creation and of the early history of man on earth as having been handed down in a direct line from mouth to mouth from Adam to Abraham through Noah, and so on to Moses, Adam himself being the recipient of the story of Creation, and the narrator of what happened in the Garden of Eden and afterwards; but in these days such childish ideas are no longer possible, and now that the horizon of man has been so vastly extended by the sciences of Anthropology and Prehistoric Archæology, as we have shown in the preceding Lectures, it becomes of supreme importance to see whether a sane and reverent criticism cannot be made the fairest handmaid both of science and religion. Sane and reverent criticism, I say; for it cannot be denied that a good deal of what has passed for such, especially in Germany, has given excuse for the accusation of irreligious rationalism, not to speak of the blatant blasphemies of Bradlaugh, or the more polished attacks of Mr. S. Laing.[1]

That it need not be so, and that the truest understanding of the Scriptures can only be attained by applying its principles, a short sketch of the progress and present position of the historical criticism of the Old Testament will show.

It was in the eighteenth century that Jean Astruc, a French physician, who towards the end of his life devoted himself to theological and linguistic studies,

[1] See Note A, p. 209.

published his *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroit que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse.* In this he first distinguished between the *Elohistic* and *Jehovistic* writers, and concluded that Moses made use of an Elohim and a Jehovah document. Eichhorn next arranged the first fifty-two chapters of the Pentateuch under the two writers, and proved that a difference of style existed in the two documents so far distinguished. De Wette pointed out the peculiarities of Deuteronomy; and Ewald, whom all students of the Old Testament acknowledge as a master, first pointed out that the differences between the Elohim and Jehovah documents extended all through the Pentateuch, and even into Joshua.

In these early days it was supposed that the document then named Elohistic, which comprised what is known as "The Priestly Code," was the earliest, and that with it were combined a historical Jehovistic document and the greater part of Deuteronomy, which, with many of the Psalms, such as the 31st, was assigned to Jeremiah.

This was the state of affairs when Bishop Colenso shook the theological world of England with his books on the Pentateuch, and when *Essays and Reviews* was published.

Meanwhile a new school was arising in Germany, represented by Graf, Wellhausen, Reuss and others, and by Kuenen in Holland, with whose views the

majority of critical students are now in the main agreed. It was seen that the old view was untenable because it allowed for no progress or development in the religion of Israel, and this was contrary to the principle of evolution on which it has pleased God to order His dealings with man, as He has ordered the organic and inorganic worlds. If the so-called Elohistic document was the oldest writing in the Hexateuch, then the religion of Israel sprang full-grown from the brain of Moses like Minerva from the head of Jove, and to this idea the data contained in the works of the earliest writing prophets and in the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, not to speak of the so-called "Jehovistic" document itself, were absolutely opposed. Moreover, a closer study of the documents showed that the so-called "Jehovistic" document was itself composite, and that many of the "Elohistic" passages in reality belonged to it. It was then that Wellhausen was led to his epoch-making discovery that the "Prophets" came before the "Law," and with this the whole history of Israel and her religion was thrown into right perspective, and the chosen race was brought into its proper relationship with the other races of mankind.

It then became possible to place the documents which enshrine the story of Israel and her religion in their historical sequence, and to bring out the progressive character of the revelation contained

in the Old Testament, and thus a great step in advance was gained.

This is the school of criticism which was first popularised in England by Matthew Arnold, the brilliant poet, critic, and writer, but somewhat flippant theologian. I can well remember the stir that was created when, in his *Literature and Dogma*, he defined "God" as "the eternal not-ourselves that makes for righteousness," and reduced the impulses of the Divine Spirit to a "stream of tendency;" but the "whirligig of time brings its revenges," and it caused me no surprise when, not long ago, I found him hailed in a sober American magazine as "Matthew Arnold, Defender of the Faith."

As a matter of fact, it has proved true in the case of the historical criticism of the Old Testament, as in other instances where science and religion have been supposed to clash, that "the Heterodoxy of one generation is the Orthodoxy of the next," and the ashes of the fires which raged around Bishop Colenso and *Essays and Reviews* and Matthew Arnold are now extinct. But the activity of the human mind will never allow controversy to die out, and the battle still rages, though the battle-ground has been shifted. It is my humble hope that these Lectures may do something towards proving that in the acceptance of critical results an eirenicon may be found for the anthropological and religious views of the origin and constitution of man.

The principal representatives of the Graf-Wellhausen school in England at the present moment in its main outlines are Professor Cheyne on the advanced, and Professor Driver on the more moderate, side. The former has done yeoman service in the cause of criticism, and is permeated throughout with a reverent dependence on the guidance of the Holy Spirit of God; but in certain of his theories he has gone beyond what a sober criticism warrants, and as regards the stress he lays upon the notion of a North Arabian land of *Muzri*, and the importance of *Jerahmeel*, he may even himself be inclined now to agree with Professor Petrie in his proofs of the real dominion of Egypt over the Sinaitic Peninsula and the consequent disappearance of any necessity for an independent "land of Muzri," and in his sarcastic references to "the dominance of Jerahmeel in a large part of modern critical literature."[1] The latter has done a splendid work in showing how the latest results of criticism are compatible with a reverent regard for the real inspiration of the Old Testament and a right understanding of its moral and spiritual teaching.

Not only in Germany, where thought is perhaps freer than anywhere else in the world, nor in our own country, where we are still to a certain extent under the dominion of formulas derived from the past, but

[1] Compare Dr. Schmidt on "The Jerahmeel Theory," *Hibbert Journal*, vol. vi. pp. 322 *seq.*

also in France, among the more learned priests and laymen of the Roman Church, the "Zeitgeist," as Matthew Arnold loved to call it, may be felt, and the new light which is shed by historical criticism upon the books both of the Old and New Testament is finding acceptance. It will suffice to mention M. Loisy, M. Houtin, and Père Lagrange. The book by the latter on *Historical Criticism and the Old Testament* has been translated into English under the auspices of the Catholic Truth Society, and is published with the imprimatur of the Roman Church, notwithstanding that it certainly contravenes the dictum of the Vatican Commission on Biblical Criticism with respect to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.[1]

It is time, then, that we should state, with as much brevity and yet perspicacity as our space permits, the results at which Biblical scholars have arrived as

[1] Since the words in the text were written, Pope Pius X. has issued a new Syllabus, and has followed it up with an Encyclical in which the doctrines of the "Modernists," as they are called, are wholly and emphatically condemned—the "Modernists" signifying such men as Father Loisy and M. Houtin in France and Father Tyrrell in England. This attitude makes one despair of the official Roman Church, and forces one to conclude that there is more hope for enlightened ideas at the hands of a statesman like Leo XIII. than at those of a "saint" like Pius X. But practically the Pope is helpless in the grasp of the Vatican camarilla, and in that group of medieval schoolmen the principles that condemned Galileo still hold sway. *Roma non movebit* is as true as it ever was, and we may thank God for the freer atmosphere of our own historic Church. See "Prospects of Modernism," by Father Tyrrell, and cf. "The Papal Encyclical," by Father Gerard, S.J., *Hibbert Journal*, vol. vi. pp. 241–263.

to the source and origin of the documents which compose the Old Testament, and when this is done it will be possible to show the bearing of these results upon the problems of Anthropology and the Christian doctrines of Sin and Salvation.

The earliest writers of Israel whose works have come down to us substantially as they left them, are the two prophets of the Northern Kingdom, Hosea and Amos, in the eighth century B.C., and contemporary with them was the compiler who combined the documents J and E into the narrative JE. This compiler has done his work so well that at times it is difficult to disentangle the constituent parts, but for the most part he has allowed each author to tell his own story, and where, as in the case of the selling of Joseph into Egypt, he has combined the two stories into one whole, it is possible by careful study to discover the portions that belong to each. This document runs right through the Hexateuch and the Books of Judges and Samuel, and was continued afterwards by the Deuteronomic editor to the end of the Books of Kings. This is known as "the Prophetic History."

The close of the eighth century witnessed the activity of the prophet Isaiah, and was signalised by the reformation of Hezekiah in Judah. Upon this followed the long reign and apostasy of Manasseh, and then at the close of the seventh century took place the great reformation of Josiah, which was the

last expiring gasp of Hebrew pre-exilic religion. This received its impetus by the finding of the "Book of the Law" in the Temple. This "Book" consisted of the central portion of our present Book of Deuteronomy. It was evidently quite new[1] and previously unheard of when first "found," and was due to the activity of a special school of prophets speaking in "the spirit and power" of Moses to a new generation as Moses would have spoken had he then been living. This school is known as that of the Deuteronomists, and by them the already combined document JE was re-edited and combined with D, making the composite document JED. Jeremiah, the greatest of the Deuteronomists, though not himself the author of D nor one of the compilers of JED, continued his active ministry to the fall of Judah and the commencement of the Captivity. During the Exile the voice of prophecy was not silent, and, among others, Ezekiel bore the message of Yahweh to his afflicted people. He was a priest, and in the last chapters of his book he describes the worship and practice of the pre-exilic Temple under the guise of a reconstituted Temple service in the future. Contemporary with him was the last and greatest exponent of the old prophetic religion of Israel, the great prophet of the Exile, whose message is contained in the last twenty-seven chapters of the Book

[1] It was thought necessary to commune with a prophetess about its validity (2 Kings xxii. 14 *seq.*).

of Isaiah, and which commences with the cry so well calculated to cheer the hearts of the fainting exiles: "Comfort ye, comfort ye My people, saith your God." But the day of the prophet was past, and prophecy henceforth takes another tone—the day of the priest had come. Following up the line indicated by Ezekiel, some among the priests embodied the previously unwritten practice of the Temple in the Law of Holiness, H, which forms the greater part of our Book of Leviticus, while others compiled a document which commences with the creation of the world, Gen. i.–ii. 4, and which runs through the whole Hexateuch *pari passu* with JE and D, and is known as P, or the Priestly Code.

After the Captivity, when the exiles returned to their own land, the documents JED, H, and P were once more edited and combined to form our present Hexateuch, and it was this finished book which was published on the occasion of the great Feast of Tabernacles recorded by Nehemiah. To the period of the Exile must also probably be assigned the Book of Job, which, under dramatic guise, describes the sufferings and subsequent restoration of Israel, the man of God.[1] The Book of Psalms, containing, in the first book, some pre-exilic compositions, finds its highest inspiration during the Exile, and down to Persian and even

[1] Professor Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, makes Job post-exilic.

Maccabean times, and was the sacred Hymn-book of the second Temple.

In the fourth century B.C. the Chronicler compiled his history in the spirit of P, and continued down to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, and in the same spirit lived and worked the latest prophets, Zechariah and Malachi; while about the same time the compiler of the Book of Daniel, which is largely written in the Aramaic or new Hebrew of the day, and contains numerous Greek words and phrases, commenced the era of Apocalypses with which the later Hebrew literature so largely abounds. In the same age were collected the ancient proverbs and wisdom-sayings of the Hebrew people, and published as "The Proverbs of Solomon," that great king having a reputation for "wisdom" which made his name an appropriate one to which to assign these "sayings"; and to him also was assigned the melancholy scepticism of the author of Ecclesiastes. These led up to the Wisdom of Solomon and to Ecclesiasticus and the later "Wisdom" literature, which, like the later Apocalypses, were not admitted into the Canon of Sacred Scripture. Finally, a place was found for Esther, because it told a splendid story of the Exile, and explained the origin of the Feast of Purim; for Ruth, because it contained a beautiful picture of life in old Israel, and bore upon the origin of the family of David; and for the exquisite little col-

lection of old Hebrew folk-songs belonging to marriage rites, which is known as the *Song of Solomon*, and about which the members of the Great Synagogue hesitated long as to whether it "defiled the hands" or not, *i.e.*, whether or not it should be admitted into the Canon, finally deciding in its favour.

With this brief summary of the results attained by criticism as to the true sequence of the documents which make up the literature of the Old Testament, it becomes possible to take the documents themselves, and discover what their writers really held and taught, and thus to trace the course and onward sweep of God's progressive revelation of Himself to Israel, and through Israel to the world.

Already to the prophets Amos and Hosea Israel is God's people in a peculiar and distinguishing sense, and she is apostatising from Him. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth," cries Amos, "therefore I will punish you for your iniquities." Under the guise of a faithless wife Hosea teaches the same lesson. Hosea knows the story of the birth of Esau and Jacob, and how the latter kept sheep for his wife in Syria, and asserts that "by a prophet" (unnamed) "Yahweh brought Israel out of Egypt, and by a prophet he was preserved." Therefore Yahweh is Israel's "God from the land of Egypt." So Amos refers more than once to the fact that God had brought Israel out of Egypt,—Israel is "the whole family which

I" (Yahweh) "brought up from the land of Egypt"; and twice over he mentions the forty years' wandering in the wilderness, showing that this was a well established tradition in his day. All this points to a long course of history before the Prophets' time—how long they only leave to be inferred—and points also to the deliverance from Egypt, the desert-wanderings, and the "taking possession of the land of the Amorite" as having been the commencement of the national life of Israel.

It is to JE that we turn to discover Israel's ideas in the eighth century as to the then already lengthy course of her history, and to trace the development of the religion of Yahweh.

From various indications, such as the prominence given to Judah in J's contrasted with the prominence given to Reuben in E's narration of the Joseph-story, we discover that J belonged to the kingdom of Judah, and E to the Northern Kingdom; both were at work collecting and committing to writing the ancient legends and traditions current in Israel in the ninth and eighth centuries, and, for the most part, as stated above, their narratives are kept distinct by the compiler.

Thus he allows J, who seems to have been a man of simple and earnest temperament, with the child-like simplicity, reverence, and faith of the poet, to tell the story of the world's early days, of Adam and his descendants, of Noah and the Flood, of the

division of the earth among the sons of Noah, of Nimrod and the Tower of Babel,[1] and does not introduce E, who appears to have been a more practical and prosaic writer, until the time of Abraham.[2] J would seem to have revelled in the folk-tales and in the stories which embodied the consciousness of the people from the remotest past, and he tells these tales without comment, and with all the frank anthropomorphism which had already become repugnant to E, and the compiler leaves them as they stand, although they presented a very different conception of God to that which was current in his own day.

Besides the stories derived from tradition and transmitted from mouth to mouth through many generations, in which Israel pictured to herself the early condition of the world and man, which stories embodied ideas descended from Neolithic and Bronze Age times, principally from Babylonian sources, and the legends of the Patriarchs from whom Israel derived her origin, which legends in reality embody the recollection of the early tribal struggles from which she evolved, in the form of stories in which the tribes are personified and become the eponymous heroes of the nation — exactly as was the case in the early Greek legends—we find traces in JE of earlier written documents which are incorporated in the narrative. The Song of Deborah,

[1] Gen. ii. 4–v., vi.–ix., xi. [2] Gen. xv.

for example, in its fire and flow, is evidently contemporary with the prophetess, and the Blessings of Jacob and of Moses are also drawn from very old material. Further, mention is made of other sources, such as "the Book of the Wars of Yahweh," which evidently contained a narrative of the struggle of the tribes of Israel after their emergence from Egypt, and from which is quoted the beautiful Song of the Well in the Book of Numbers, and "the Book of Jashar"; while for later times the continuation of the "prophetical document" mentions numerous sources, such as the Book of Gad the seer, of Nathan the prophet, etc.

An original source is also to be discovered in the Book of the Covenant, both in its longer and shorter recensions, which may very well contain material from the hand of Moses himself, such as the original form of the "Ten Words" (without the priestly commentaries on the Second and Fourth Commandments), but which points notwithstanding to a long continued agricultural life on the part of the people.[1]

Israel herself, as previously stated, was the youngest of the nations. Her history cannot be said, in any strict use of the term, to commence before the Exodus, which Kuenen dated in 1320 B.C., but which Professor Petrie brings down still further to ten years before or after 1285 B.C., if indeed we can speak of actual history before the time of

[1] Ex. xx.–xxiv., xxxiv.

David. The histories of Egypt and of Babylon, from which latter country she derived her origin, ascend to more than three thousand years before this date, and four hundred years before it the Mycenean Bronze Age civilisation of the Egean had attained its zenith.

The only thing that differentiated Israel from her neighbours, from the point of view of world-importance in the future, was the fact that she possessed a literature which was destined, as the vehicle of a religion which gave birth in process of time to a world-religion, to be never lost sight of; whereas the histories and religious opinions of these neighbours, greater and mightier than herself, were for ages lost, and have only been recovered during the last hundred years by the spade of the excavator, and the patient labour of scholars in deciphering the remains of civilisations so long perished and unknown.

Whence was this? It was because Israel, under the inspiration, as we believe, of the living Spirit of God, and through the influence of the Prophets, commencing with Moses, who were the living vehicles of revelation, attained in a manner peculiar to herself, at a comparatively early period, to adequate notions of God, of man's relationship to God, and of the worship due to Him.

As we study the document JE, now under consideration, we can observe the evolution of the

ideas of God, of man, and of religion, in Israel, up to the eighth century B.C.

Like the religions of Egypt, of Babylonia (from which her own was more directly derived), of Greece, and of all the nations of antiquity, Israel starts from ideas rooted in animism, fetishism, and polytheism, which have come down from Neolithic times, which to a more or less advanced degree mark the savage races of to-day, and which, in the shape of folklore and fairy tale, find their echoes among ourselves.

In the account given by J of the first man and woman in the beautiful garden from which they are expelled for disobedience to the behest of Yahweh, and of the subsequent fortunes of the antediluvians, we have a comparatively late but thoroughly poetic picture of the way in which the story-tellers of Israel tried to explain the origin of civilisation and the mysteries of sin, sorrow, and death. We can trace the old animistic religion in the part played by the serpent and the two sacred trees in the garden; and Yahweh is, as previously stated, frankly anthropomorphic, although He clearly stands out as the Maker and Ruler of man, which is a step in advance, and marks the late emergence of the story as we have it.

In the account of the days before the Deluge we find the *B'nê ha-Elohim*, the spirits of the air, having intercourse with mortal women, and their progeny

in the "giants who were in the earth in those days," a story which may be paralleled in every race, and which survives in the stories of giants which delight our children.

In the story of the Garden of Eden Yahweh is, apart from later touches, no more than a magnified man, resembling closely, though on a slightly higher level perhaps, Daramulun or Baiame, or the All-Father of the Australians, Unkulunkulu of the Zulus, Nzambi, Mbuiri, or Tando of the West Africans and others, the principal distinction being that whereas these and other savage races have never advanced to any higher ideas owing to the unpromising nature of their environment, civilised man, commencing with the Semites and, above all, the Prophets of Israel, has been ever advancing towards more and more spiritual ideas of God. Yahweh meets man in friendly intercourse, he walks in the garden in the cool of the day, he brings the animals to man to see what he will call them, but he also commands and punishes.

When the Tower of Babel is being built, Yahweh hears a rumour of it up in heaven, and comes down to see what is going on, whereupon, in dread lest man should become too powerful, he confuses their tongues, and brings about the dispersion of the nations.

Passing on to the stories of the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, we find in these a

highly idealised picture of what the inspired writers of the eighth century conceived to be the origin of their own race, together with much material derived from primitive traditional ideas, which had still a living force in that age.

Whether Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and his sons represent actual individuals is not relevant to our subject. It is possible that they do; but what is certain is that under the form of biography they tell us what was traditionally current as to the movements of the Israelitish clans before they crystallised into a nation, and they also, in the characters drawn, give a wonderfully accurate portrait of the several characteristics of the Hebrew people.

In Abraham we see the Puritan who obeys the inner call, which he recognises as the voice of Yahweh, and, like a true Semite, abandons the ancient civilisation and cult of the Chaldean empire, throws off the shackles of city life, and goes out into the unknown to lead the simple life in direct dependence upon God. In Isaac we see the quiet, contemplative man, who communes with the Unseen, and is so filled with the spirit of other-worldliness that he becomes the prey of his more worldly relatives. In Jacob the keen business capabilities and cunning of the race stand prominently out.[1]

J tells us of direct theophanies and visions of

[1] See Note B, p. 211.

angels; E tells us of communications by means of dreams and oracles, and it is he also who tells us of the early struggle to put down the practice of human sacrifice,[1] which had descended from Neolithic times, and was a marked feature of the Chaldean cult, as it was of the surrounding nations, Moab, Phœnicia, etc., and which is to be found in all survivals of primitive religion, whether it be the Greeks and Romans, the Mexicans when first discovered, or in Ashantee, Dahomey, and other West African tribes down to the present day—the practice being founded on a primitive instinct of the human mind to seek communion and fellowship with the deity through the offering of the most precious human possession, and thereby to secure the favour and protection of the divinity worshipped.

It never seems, however, to have had a place in Egyptian religion at any period.

In other respects also the stories of the Patriarchs are full of reminiscences of primitive religion. When the ancestors of the Hebrews first entered Canaan, they entered a land in which the ancient animistic beliefs were emerging into a higher faith—the cult of the Baal, the lord of the land—but in which the practices of animism still held sway.

Thus we find Abraham setting up his altars to Yahweh under the sacred tree which marked each of the localities chosen for his halting-places; Isaac

[1] Gen. xxii.

worships at the holy wells; and Jacob not only worships at the dolmens which marked the resting-places of Neolithic warriors, and consecrates these shrines of ancestor-worship to the cult of Yahweh, but associates himself with the worship of the sacred pillar which marks the presence of the divinity, and he also enters into communion with the deity who dwells therein by the ceremony of anointing with oil—a refinement on the more ancient smearing with the fat of the sacrifice, of which the god and his worshipper then partook. Jacob also sets up boundary-pillars and "heaps of stones" to mark off the territory of Yahweh from that of his neighbours, from whence Yahweh may keep watch and ward over his land. It is in the camp of Jacob, too, that we find mention made of the *teraphim*, or figurines, like those described on p. 113, which represented the household divinities of the tribe, as did the Lares and Penates of the Romans, the place of which is taken by the figures of the saints, or the sacred pictures, in every house in countries owning allegiance to the Roman and Greek Churches to-day.

It should be observed here that in speaking of "Yahweh" in the age of the Patriarchs we do so by a prolepsis, of which JE sets us the example; for the cult of Yahweh as the national God of Israel was not established until the time of Moses, and was the fruit of his work. It is going too far to say with the *Encyclopedia Biblica* that Moses himself is unhistori-

cal, and to hold it doubtful whether such a personage in fact existed. I believe that a sane and sober criticism, while holding that much which is attributed popularly to Moses is unhistoric, including the whole of the Deuteronomic and Priestly legislation and a great part of that comprised in JE, must yet admit that the exodus from Egypt is a historic fact, that it was the work of Moses, who was a great leader and legislator, and the reformer of the national faith. The recent book of Professor Petrie, *Researches in Sinai*, has made it probable that the numbers of those who came out of Egypt have been enormously exaggerated, through the rendering of "*Alef*" by "thousand" instead of "family," and that the actual number of heads of families was about 5000, a body quite capable of being supported by the resources of the country during a prolonged stay in the Sinaitic Peninsula, and also of forming the nucleus of the host by whom the very gradual conquest of Canaan was undertaken,—whether the manna could have been snow seems very doubtful,—but all the details of the story, so far as historical, become hereby very much simplified.

Moses was not, indeed, in any sense a monotheist—the time for monotheism had not yet arrived. The religion he taught was henotheism and monolatry, as may be seen in the very phraseology of the first three of the "Ten Words." Yahweh is the God of Israel, and it would be gross ingratitude for Israel to

worship any other gods. He had been worshipped in Egypt apparently under the form of an ox or calf, a worship which Aaron strove to perpetuate, and which was re-established by Jeroboam I., but Moses would have none of it. Yahweh's dwelling-place is on Sinai, where the people heard his voice in the thunder, but saw no similitude, the only visible tokens of his presence being the lightning flashes which accompanied his manifestation.

Besides his dwelling-place on Sinai, Yahweh was also locally present in the camp of his people in the Ark, which was their most sacred possession, and the pledge of that presence lay in the block of unhewn stone which the Ark enshrined. This was entirely on the lines of primitive religion, and its counterpart is to be found in the unhewn or roughly hewn stones of Palæolithic and Neolithic times, and in the aniconic stones and baetylic altars of the Mycenean cult. The work of Moses consisted first in the leading of Israel out of Egypt at the behest and under the protection of Yahweh whose servant he was, and then in the purifying and reform of a long established cultus, and in the legislation, the outlines of which are contained in the "Ten Words" and the Book of the Covenant, both in its earlier and later recensions (Exodus xxxiv. and xx.–xxiii.). To him also, as is plainly witnessed in the Oldest Document, is to be attributed the earliest adumbration of the idea of the holiness of Yahweh, which, although it

had its origin in the primitive notion of "taboo," yet received from Moses the first outline of that ethical significance which in the hand of the succeeding "Prophets," of whom he was the first, received its gradually increasing spirituality, and became under the Priestly Code the dominant note of Israel and the God whom she worshipped.

But the reforms to which Moses gave the earliest expression had little effect upon the nation for generations after, as may be seen when the older documents which run through the historical books from Judges to Kings are separated from the prophetic and Deuteronomic additions, and when we remember that it was the practice of later historians to throw back into the past the customs of their own age. Thus even in the eighth century the notion entertained of Yahweh was still very crude, and the cultus retained to a considerable extent the characteristics of earlier times.

In the Song of Deborah, as in some of the earlier Psalms (though perhaps in these the idea was more poetic than real), Yahweh still has his abode on Sinai, whence he comes to fight for and bring deliverance to his people.

Jephthah practises human sacrifice, and, in his remonstrance with the king of Moab, he asks him why he cannot be content with the land which Chemosh his god has given him, and leave to Israel peaceful possession of the land which Yahweh her God has

given her—Chemosh being recognised as the god of Moab in as true a sense as Yahweh was the God of Israel. Here, however, we must also notice the earliest historical recognition of Canaan as Yahweh's land, because he had given Israel possession of it, and the transition to the belief that Yahweh had abandoned his ancient abode on Sinai, and taken up his dwelling in the land which he had given to his people, became easy, and the way was prepared for the further belief that he had ousted the Baals of Canaan, but must nevertheless be worshipped at the old shrines and in the old way, and thus the syncretism of early Israelitish religion in Canaan becomes easily explicable.

In the days of Eli the Ark, which enshrined the presence of Yahweh at Shiloh, fell into the hands of the Philistines, and no real prosperity could accrue to Israel until it was restored. Yet Canaan is still Yahweh's land, and one of the reproaches which David levelled at Saul consists in the fact that, having driven him out of Yahweh's land, he can no longer worship Him, but must perforce worship the god of the land in which he had taken refuge.

Looking at Yahweh in this light, as the national god, it was perfectly natural for Solomon to build altars at which his foreign wives could worship the gods of their respective nations, though *we* may sympathise with the horror expressed by the Deuteronomic editor at the practice.

Elijah, on Mount Carmel, when he had repaired the altar of Yahweh which had been allowed to fall into ruins,—the significance of which will be referred to later,—does not reproach Israel for forsaking the only God for a false one, however much this may have been read into the story, but only in that they, the people of Yahweh, have allowed themselves to be seduced by Jezebel to worship the Tyrian Baal or Melcarth.

The question now arises: What were the characteristics of the cult of Yahweh in Israel up to and including the eighth century?

To answer this question we must free our minds from all ideas derived from the statements of later writers, who, as we have said, were in the habit of projecting into the past the thoughts and practices of their own times, and we must confine ourselves entirely to the data contained in JE and the prophetical continuation of his story to his own time, apart from all Deuteronomic and Priestly additions.

Casting a broad and comprehensive glance over the material thus provided, the first thing to strike us is the fact that the religion of old Israel was free, joyous, and unconstrained. No problems of sin and judgment and the inequalities of life bore as yet upon the nation. Israel kept her weekly and monthly feasts, her "sabbaths and her new moons"; and an annual feast, at the place where the Ark of Yahweh was located, which corresponded with the

ingathering of the harvest, while there are traces in early times of two other feasts which were afterwards developed into those of the Passover and Tabernacles; but, as their name implies, these were occasions of joyful gatherings of families and tribes, or of the nation, when the worshippers, after entering into communion with Yahweh by a partaking in common of the flesh of slain beasts, the choicest parts of which belonged to Yahweh and were consumed by the priest if he were present, indulged in festal dances and merry-making. The advent of a stranger, especially if he were a prophet, was also the occasion for a festal sacrifice (1 Sam. xvi.). Worship was offered to Yahweh, who had taken the place of the Canaanite Baals as the Lord of the land, in the high places, consecrated from of old, and originally, probably, the scenes of Neolithic ancestor-worship, and "under every green tree," *i.e.*, the trees accounted sacred from ancient times, the "juju" trees of the aboriginal tribes, and beside sacred wells and streams, and old Neolithic cairns and dolmens, which were usually on elevated ground. These would serve as altars for worship, or, in their absence, the unhewn altar would be set up, and beside it would stand the sacred pole, the Asherah, and the sacred stone, the Matzebah, the shrines of the deity whose presence they represented and ensured. An altar of this kind was the "altar of Yahweh" which Elijah repaired on Mount Carmel;

and even the temple of Solomon was not considered complete until the twin "Pillars of the House," as at Knossos and Mycenæ, were erected in front of the Porch.

In connection with all these survivals in religious thought and practice derived from the old animistic faith, there was, as might be expected, much superstition, which had its roots in fetishism such as we find in modern savage religions, and of which so much survived to be a dark blot on medieval Europe.

The belief in witches and in witchcraft was universal, and the practice of magic was very prevalent. It is as easy, if not easier, for primitive man to believe in malevolent as in benevolent spirits; for while the evil spirits are very active, and do untold mischief to crops and flocks and herds, and deal death and destruction on the wings of stormy wind and tempest, and in the blast of the murrain and the pestilence, the good spirits are often lethargic and inactive, or sit in silent contemplation at a height far removed from the world of men and affairs. Magic *is* the religion of primitive man as it affects the evil spirits, and the belief in it was as potent in old Israel as it was in Europe down to recent times. The best minds in Israel, taking for granted the reality of the powers of magic and witchcraft, set themselves steadily to put down the evil thing in the interest of the true religion of

Yahweh. Even the oldest Code contains the enactment, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," and this was repeated, with further details, in the later Codes. Yet Moses himself was a great magician, as witness the plagues of Egypt, many of which were matched by the magicians of Pharaoh's court. Balaam was a great magician, and when Yahweh turned his sorceries against Israel into blessings, he bewitched the people so that they turned aside to follow Baal-peor.

When Abimelech made himself king in Shechem, it was a "wise woman" who caused his overthrow. Saul, the first recognised king of Israel, set himself to root the witches out of the land with a zeal as great as that of Matthew Hopkins, the celebrated witch-finder of King James's time; yet he himself was believed to be bewitched by an evil spirit which caused all his troubles, and which later writers called "an evil spirit from Yahweh," implying that it was sent to punish him for his disobedience to Yahweh's behests, and it was only the music of David's harp that could bring relief to the unhappy monarch. In these days we should say that Saul suffered from melancholia and passing fits of madness, the paroxysms of which were soothed by the strains produced by the shepherd-lad—an effect which is testified to by Shakespeare, and beautifully described in Browning's *Saul*.

In spite of his vigorous proceedings against the

witches, it is Saul who in the crisis of his fate is glad enough to have recourse to one, to find, if he can, some alleviation for his troubled soul; and the Witch of Endor is recorded to have brought Samuel from the tomb by her necromantic arts, but only to pronounce Saul's final doom.

David was reconciled to Absalom by the device of Joab in bringing a "wise woman" from Tekoah to influence the king in favour of his son.

Jezebel, a much maligned woman, whose only real object was to introduce something of the civilisation and amenities of life which characterised the court of Tyre into the barbaric court of Ahab, was denounced as a witch and met a witch's fate at the hands of Jehu. This is not to say that Elijah was not right in opposing her projects, for in leading the people to worship the Tyrian Baal she was seducing them from the worship of Yahweh, Israel's God, but only to show how in those days, as in later ages, what was misunderstood was immediately explained as witchcraft.

From their own point of view, and from the point of view of the religion of Yahweh, the compilers of the Israelitish codes were perfectly right in their denouncement of witchcraft, and believing in the reality of the magic powers supposed to be possessed by the witches, they could not but suppress it with a strong hand, for it belonged to a lower phase of religion, and was opposed to the worship of the

righteous Yahweh; but no one will ever know the amount of untold misery and suffering which was brought upon thousands of unhappy men and women, perhaps worst of all in the seventeenth century in England and Scotland, by taking the enactments of those Codes as the inspired sanction for a belief in the reality of witchcraft, and as being valid for all time!

Thus the picture we have drawn from the oldest Hebrew documents shows us Israel, as regards her popular beliefs and practices, in no way differing from the nations by whom she was surrounded. The popular religion consisted in the worship indeed of Yahweh, but it was at the ancient shrines and in the ancient modes practised by their predecessors in the land.

The expressions used by the king of Moab in addressing Chemosh (on the Moabite Stone) are precisely those which any pious Israelite might have addressed to Yahweh. And meanwhile superstition was rife, and beliefs derived from the old animistic and fetishistic religions held full possession of the people's heart.

But a force was at work which was destined to lead Israel onward and upward till she arrived at a true idea of God, and prepared the way for the revelation of God in Christ, and this force lay in the *Prophets*.

The consideration of the work of the Prophets

and their influence upon Israel and the world is reserved for our final Lecture.

NOTE A, p. 179.

In this connection it is interesting to observe Browning's justification of the "Higher Criticism" of the Iliad as inaugurated by Wolf in his *Prolegomena*, in a poem entitled "Development" in his latest book, *Asolando*. Much of Wolf's criticism of Homer has indeed passed into the limbo of forgotten things, and most scholars now believe that the blind poet was in fact the author of the great works that have gone for so long by his name, however much they may have been edited, added to, and revised in later times; but the words of Browning may be well applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, which, *me judice*, has in its broad outlines, and without committing oneself to every detail, come to stay.

The circumstances of the two cases are wholly different: in the one we are dealing with an entire literature, in the other with a single set of poems.

However, let us hear Browning. He describes how in his childhood, at five years old, he first heard the story of Troy from his father, then two or three years afterwards he read Pope's *Iliad*, and at last, having learned Greek, attacked Homer for himself, and read the grand old story in its majestic hexameters, and Homer and his heroes and heroines were all real to him. Then he proceeds:—

"Thus did youth spend a comfortable time;
Until—'What's this the Germans say is fact
That Wolf found out first? Its unpleasant work
Their chop and change, unsettling one's belief.
All the same, while we live, we learn, that's sure.'
So I bent brow o'er *Prolegomena.*
And, after Wolf, a dozen of his like
Proved there was never any Troy at all,
Neither Besiegers nor Besieged,—nay, worse,—
No actual Homer, no authentic text,
No warrant for the fiction I, as fact,
Had treasured in my heart and soul so long—
Ay, mark you! and a fact held still, still hold,
Spite of new knowledge, in my heart of hearts
And soul of souls, fact's essence freed and fixed
From accidental fancy's guardian sheath.
Assuredly thenceforward—thank my stars!—
However it got there, deprive who could—
Wring from the shrine my precious tenantry,
Helen, Ulysses, Hector and his spouse,
Achilles and his Friend? . . .

But then 'No dream's worth waking'—[Browning says:]
And here's the reason why I tell thus much.
I, now mature man, you anticipate,
May blame my Father justifiably
For letting me dream out my nonage thus,
And only by such slow and sure degrees
Permitting me to sift the grain from chaff,
Get truth and falsehood, known and named as such.
Why did he ever let me dream at all,
Nor bid me taste the story in its strength?
I might have—somehow—correspondingly—
Been taught by forthrights not meanderings,
My aims should be to loathe, like Peleus' son,
A lie as Hell's gate, love my wedded wife,
Like Hector, and so on with all the rest.
Could not I have excogitated this
Without believing such men really were?"

Thus, in precisely the same manner, the child, and those in the position of children, the unlearned, the pagan, may learn from those simple Old Testament stories, which are as real to them as any fairy tale, the evil of disobedience, of yielding to the lusts of the flesh, of lying, of murder, with the sense of shame, of *sin*, and of fear which these produce; and, on the other hand, the beauty of truth, of purity, of self-denial, of obedience, of heroism—in a word, of *virtue*, which in its totality is beautiful as *vice* is hideous; and these lessons endure even though the tales in which they are enshrined are shown in later life to be but the fancy and the poetry of the childhood of our race.

NOTE B, p. 196.

Discussing "The 'Jerahmeel' theory and the historical importance of the Negeb" in the *Hibbert Journal*, January 1908, Professor Schmidt says: "Scholars have widely accepted the view that Abram once was the local divinity and hero of the Calebites in Hebron." He states that "Professor Eduard Meyer regards Moses as the mythical ancestor of the Levitical priesthood at Kadesh Barnea, and first representative there of the cult of Yahwe, the God of Sinai, a volcanic mountain in Southern Edom"; and continues: "Professor Felix Adler once called my attention to the remarkable similarity of the story of Aaron to that of Jeroboam. Both make golden calves; the sons of both have the same names, Nadab and Abihu.

The figure of Aaron seems, indeed, to have been modelled, or remodelled, on that of Jeroboam. I prefer to say remodelled, because originally he appears to have been an Edomitish divinity, having his shrines on Mosera and Hor. . . . As an Edomitish god, Aaron was apparently coupled with his brother Moses, the 'deliverer.' Now Jeroboam had been a sojourner in Egypt, and an Egyptian sojourn may, therefore, also have been ascribed to that other maker of golden calves and father of Nadab and Abihu. Moses, the 'deliverer,' who had his shrines farther south, on Sinai and at Kadesh Barnea, then, naturally followed his older brother."

The conclusion Dr. Schmidt draws is as follows:—

"From a religious point of view the historical importance of the Negeb can be summed up in the following statements. It was the land where the patriarchal figures, Abram, Isaac, Jacob, Lot and Ishmael, Sarah, Rebecca, and others developed, by a rationalising process, from local divinities to human heroes, types, ideals. It was the home of Mosaism, where an influential priesthood learnt to use the *torah*, to give oracles in the name of the mythical ancestor, and whence, therefore, the impulses came which in course of time produced the Ephraimitish Code, Deuteronomy, the priestly laws of the Persian period, the Mishnah and the Talmuds. It was the cradle, if not the birthplace, of Yahwism, where the faith was first nursed which issued in the religion of the prophets, Christianity, and Islam."

LECTURE THE SIXTH

ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

"Christianity as a historical religion cannot be exempted from the principles of historical inquiry; nor can the Bible, as literature, be exempted from the canons of criticism which apply to the other religions of the world and their sacred books.

"On one side we now compare religions; on the other, a closer and more intimate knowledge of the Bible itself, as a living book and not a mere repertory for proof texts, is one of the marks of our time.

"Criticism has been bringing the sacred books into relation with the sacred history, and has done something to restore them to their real and living significance; . . . by binding book and people together, and thus connecting them with the providential order of the world, it has given back the idea of the God who lives in history. . . .

"Whatever be the results of the literary analysis of the biblical books or the bearing of archæological discovery on the history they record, this is the aim of historical criticism."—HASTINGS' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

"The Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament do not claim to be history, but books of devotion. It is very characteristic that the Jewish Canon itself does not know the designation 'historical books,' but includes the histories among the prophets. . . .

"It is a matter of course that the methods of the Higher Criticism alone enable us to understand and appreciate the Bible."—CORNILL, *Prophets of Israel.*

"Unduped of fancy, henceforth man
Must labour!—must resign
His all too human creeds, and scan
Simply the way divine!
. . . . . .
The world's great order dawns in sheen,
After long darkness rude,
Divinelier imaged, clearer seen,
With happier zeal pursued.

What still of strength is left, employ
That end to help, attain:
One common wave of thought and joy
Lifting mankind again!"

MATTHEW ARNOLD, *Obermann once more.*

LECTURE THE SIXTH

At the commencement of his treatise the post-apostolic writer of the so-called "Epistle" to the Hebrews sums up the Christian view of the method by which God had been pleased to carry out His revelation to mankind. In old times God had spoken to the fathers by divers portions and in divers manners in the Prophets, and now in these last days He has spoken unto us in His Son. A better summary of the progressive nature of God's revelation could not be given, and in it there is the expression of the innate consciousness of the Hebrew people that all through their long and varied history they had been in a condition of special relationship with God, which was intended to lead up to the culminating revelation of Himself in the Person of Jesus Christ, who from the human and national point of view was the last of the Prophets, and from the divine side was, and is, His Son.

How the Jewish people and their rulers came to miss this great fact, which was the *raison d'être* of all their history, does not concern us here. It was reserved for a few among them, and those not the

most important, to grasp it, and in passing it on as the gospel of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, to transform what was of purely passing and local significance into a world-religion; and this world-religion still contains a message of supreme importance to mankind, when divested of all those transitory notions as to the world and man which the progress of science has made it impossible any longer to hold.

God spoke of old time to the fathers in the Prophets—*i.e.*, the prophets of Israel were the bearers in different ways and in many portions of a unique message from God to man.

Prophetism is the grand outstanding fact of Israel.

But the thing itself was not unique—it is only so when viewed in its outcome and results.

We have seen that the religion of Israel in the eighth century B.C. differed little whether in ideas or ritual from the religions of the surrounding nations, but there was a motive force in Israel which carried her forward to a point which the surrounding nations never attained. This force resided in the Prophets. But neither in its origin was prophetism unique. The spirit which, under the guiding hand of God, issued in the prophets of Israel is inherent in all primitive religions, just as is also the spirit which led up to the priest; but the prophet is older than the priest, and this fact, which comparative

religion teaches, furnishes an external proof of the truth of Wellhausen's dictum as to Israel, that "the Prophets preceded the Law."

That is to say, the spirit of prophetism is consistent with, and may find its source in, animism; the priest does not derive from earlier times than those when animism has already passed into fetishism, and fetishism is passing into polytheism.

Among the most primitive animistic peoples of the present day we find the prophet—the medicine-man and magician, who delivers messages from some divine source—by whatever name he may be called; where the religion is fetish and polytheistic, there we find also the priest. The Australian natives are examples of the former; the West Africans, and, in the South, the Becwana and others, if not the Zulus, of the latter; and whereas in the animistic stage totemism is a living social arrangement, in the later stage it is decadent or dead. Israel had long passed, like the nations from which she sprang, through the stages of animism and fetishism, before she appears on the page of history, although traces of both, as we have seen, survive through all her literature in the shape of folk-tales and folklore, as they do among the cultured races to-day; and although the popular religion was ever tending towards a syncretistic polytheism, yet from the earliest dawn of her national consciousness there were those among her greater sons who had conceived the idea of heno-

theism—that one God—who was afterwards known as Yahweh—belonged to Israel, and that to Him alone worship was due. Thus through henotheism and monolatry the way was prepared for the future monotheistic faith. To this the stories of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob point, and the God of Israel is known as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, before the name of Yahweh is proclaimed as His distinctive title by Moses.

Moses and Aaron come before us as the Prophet and the Priest in the pages of the Hexateuch; but in thinking of them as they actually were we must divest ourselves of all ideas derived from D and P, in which we have the finished conception of later writers transferred to the distant past, and even of much that had grown around them by the time that JE was composed, and we must look at them in the light of Israel's religion as we know it, from the Books of Judges and Samuel apart from Deuteronomic redaction. From this we see that Moses was a prophet, because he felt himself to be acting under the direct influence of Yahweh, whose oracles were committed to him, although his work only consisted in leading a small band of fugitive slaves out of Egypt, and was so insignificant that it was not deemed worthy of being noticed on any Egyptian monument; and in bidding the people worship only Yahweh, their deliverer, he was sowing the seeds of a faith destined to bring forth fruit that

he knew not of; and Aaron was the priest of a simple cultus, the full ritual of which did not develop for a thousand years. But these two great men set Israel on the road which was destined to be of world-wide significance, although we must judge of them by the data derived from the earliest documents as interpreted according to the spirit of the age in which they lived, apart altogether from the ideas belonging to the age in which those earliest documents themselves took shape, and, of course, apart from the later development which those ideas attained in the Deuteronomic and Priestly redaction.

After the fall of Israel in 720 B.C., the insignificant kingdom of Judah alone remained as the shrine of Yahweh worship, and the Prophets, of whom Isaiah was the greatest, set themselves, during the reign of Hezekiah, to purify that worship still further, and especially to set it free from the polytheistic associations which were inevitably attached to the old high places by concentrating the cultus at Jerusalem; though even Isaiah does not object to the Matzebah, which accompanied the hill-altars as the pledge of the presence of Yahweh, *per se*, for he looks forward to the time when a Matzebah to Yahweh shall be set up in the land of Egypt.[1] Hezekiah's reformation was a failure, and only led to the frightful reaction under Manasseh, but during all that dreadful time a faithful band of followers of Isaiah was

[1] See Additional Note, p. 269.

at work, and it was by them that the Book of Deuteronomy was compiled, and the reform of the older Codes of Law and Ritual carried out on the basis of the unification and concentration of worship at Jerusalem, the place which Yahweh had chosen, and the entire abolition of all the outlying shrines. Thus the foundations were laid of the great reformation which was accomplished under Josiah, when the "Book of the Law" (*i.e.*, the Book of Deuteronomy from chapter xii. to xxviii., omitting chapter xxvii.) was "found." There is no question here of "forgery." These prophetic men only carried on the progressive revelation of God a step further, and legislated as Moses would have done had he lived in their age. Israel, or all that was left of it in Judah, was the one holy people of the one holy God, and it was fitting that He should be worshipped in one holy place, while the advance in spirituality is seen in the emphasis laid upon love. "Thou shalt love Yahweh thy God" is the foundation of the whole Deuteronomic legislation. With the final abolition of the high places the country priests were removed to Jerusalem, and assigned duties in the Temple service as "Levites," a secondary order inferior to the Temple hierophants, who thus became priests *par excellence*. But the reformation of Josiah was short-lived; for, in spite of all the efforts of Jeremiah, the death-knell of the monarchy had struck, and in 596 and the following years Jerusalem was destroyed, the Temple burnt,

and the remnant of the people transported to Babylon. It was then, during the long years of the Captivity, that the redaction of the Hexateuch and the historical books was carried out in a Deuteronomic sense; at the same time Ezekiel prophesied, and thought out the plans for a reformed ritual on the basis of the pre-existing usage, and a band of priestly writers compiled the Priestly Code and the legislation of Leviticus, which carried the reformed ritual a stage further than even Ezekiel had dreamed of. Thus the way was prepared for the emergence of the Jews from the fires of the Captivity as a Church-nation, and for the publication of the finally edited Hexateuch and the stereotyping of religion as a due performance of a fixed code of ritual in the second Temple under Ezra and Nehemiah. But the Captivity did more than this for the best minds among the captives of Judah. It gave a sad and gloomy turn to their thoughts, which impressed them with a sense of sin, as an offence against a holy God, as they had never been impressed before. It taught them that earthly prosperity is no proof of the favour of God, but that the very sufferings of the righteous may be, and are, a proof of His love and of His guiding and educative hand upon them. Then they learnt the meaning of sacrifice as expiation as well as communion, and began to look for the Deliverer, the Righteous One, who should be at once the Messianic King and the Suffering

Servant of Yahweh; and in this way a further step was taken in the preparation for the Christ. Thus they allowed the old story of the Fall, with its foreshadowing of One who should overcome the serpent, to stand in their sacred books, but the question of what is called Original Sin derived from a definite act on the part of the progenitors of the human race did not trouble them very much, and they never refer to it again. It is only in the Pauline theology that it reappears and takes a leading place in that great theologian's scheme, in the rabbinical contrast which, in accordance with his conception of man's creation and of his lapse from God's original intention with regard to him, he draws between the first Adam who was "a living soul" and the second Adam, the Christ, conceived as the archetypal man present from all eternity in God, and manifested in human flesh, who is a quickening, *i.e.* a life-giving, spirit.

It is much more with sin in the nation and sin in the individual that they are concerned; and sin is, for the first time, spiritually conceived as being not a mere infraction of an objective law, but as an inherent bias to wrong on the part of every member of the human race. The writer of the Book of Job, impressed with Zoroastrian teaching, is the first to introduce Satan as a distinct personality, hostile to the human race, the embodiment and leader of all the old animistic spirits of evil; but he keeps

himself free from its dualism by making Satan subordinate to Yahweh and one of his servants, just as the lying spirit in the mouth of the prophets of Ahab is beheld by Micaiah coming forth from Yahweh in the latest recension of the Books of Kings, and the same subordinate position is assigned to Satan later on by Zechariah, and by the author of the Books of Chronicles in his version of the story of David numbering Israel.

Job is a righteous man, typical of Israel, and by his unmerited troubles—unmerited so far as outward acts are concerned—he learns the lesson which Israel learnt in the Captivity, *i.e.*, in the person of her noblest sons, that the holiest of men cannot stand acquitted in the presence of God: "I have heard of Thee with the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee, *wherefore* I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." It was the same lesson which Isaiah had learnt at the time of his call, when he beheld the wondrous vision of Yahweh, and saw the seraphim standing veiled before Him: "I am a man of unclean lips . . . and mine eyes have seen Yahweh, Yahweh of hosts"; the same lesson which St. Peter learnt, as he stood in the presence of the Christ: "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord;" the same lesson which every saint has learnt in proportion as he knows more of God and of himself. Thus it was during the Captivity that the Second Isaiah uttered that marvellous threnody in

which he portrays the sufferings of God's righteous Servant on account of, and on behalf of, sin—sin, not His own, but ours ;[1] and it was while they were in the same furnace of affliction that we hear the plaintive wail of the 51st Psalm, and the triumphant answer of the 32nd Psalm, the thunderings of Ezekiel against sin, and the promises of the impartation of a new heart and a new spirit, in which sin shall be conquered and goodness become possible for man.

The Captivity ends ; after many vicissitudes the people are restored to their own land, no longer as an independent kingdom, but a subject province, first of the Persian, then of the Greek—we make no account here of the brief spell of independence won by the Maccabees after the atrocious persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, for it was a priestly, not a regal independence—then of the Roman, empires.

During this period the long line of the Prophets ends with Malachi ; the free spirit of God breathing in the heart and finding utterance on the lips of the "Chosen Man" becomes dumb. "We see not our tokens ; there is no Prophet more," is the lamentable wail of more than one of the later Psalmists ; and in place of the Prophet there comes the Wisdom Literature, very beautiful and very instructive, but speculative and practical rather than spiritual and revealing ; and the Voice of God is heard no more until it reawakens in John the Baptist, the fore-

[1] Isa. liii.

runner of the Christ; *He* is Himself the "Word of God," and after His departure the Spirit of God continues for a time, during the first enthusiastic outburst of Church-life, to speak through His followers, until once more the free Spirit is quenched in the stereotyping of religion. The universal course which religion has taken in every race and nation of mankind, to a greater or less degree, is here exemplified. It is always first the Prophet, then the Priest; first the free utterance of the inspiring spirit, then the fixing of rites and ceremonies according to rigidly appointed rule and order; first the evoking of devotion in faith and love to an inspired person on the part of those who will listen to his message, then the fixation of religion according to hard and fast formulæ, and the making it consist in belief in certain dogmas and doctrines rather than in personal love and devotion—belief *about* instead of faith *in* the inspired person.[1]

The evolution of religious ideas and the methods of worship took a course precisely analogous to this among the Jews after the Captivity. As we have seen, the Prophet ceased, and with a deepening sense of sin, as at once an offence against God and the result of moral obliquity, the Priest comes into his heritage. The proof of this is to be found in the completion and the promulgation of the Priestly Code, and the importance attached to sacrifice. But

[1] Cf. Dr. Paul Wernle, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion.*

sacrifice has taken on a new connotation unknown to old Israel. It is no longer wholly, if at all, a joyous feast in which the worshipper enters by the act of eating into communion and fellowship with his God, a means whereby he becomes a partaker in and a sharer of the Divine life, but the deepening sense of sin, casting a gloom over human life, and a dark shadow over the soul, has brought with it a growing sense of the need of a Redeemer and of redemption from sin. Over against God stands Satan, subordinate, it is true, but the adversary of mankind, the sovereign of the powers of evil, through whose malign influence man has come under the bondage of sin, from whom, in being redeemed from sin, he shall be set free; and so, alongside the impassioned utterances of the Second Isaiah, of Ezekiel, and of the later Psalms, we have the ritual of Leviticus, of the sin-offering, the burnt-offering, and the peace-offering, and that of the great Day of Atonement and of the Scapegoat. In this latter, indeed, we have an adaptation of very early animistic conceptions, which had no doubt survived in the folklore of the people, to the necessities of the more recently evolved notions of sin and the idea of a sin-bearer. Thus sacrifice has become a means of expiation, of propitiation, of atonement—at-one-ment—of reconciliation between God and man. In the emphasis laid upon the death of the slain beast, the pouring out and sprinkling of the blood which is its *life*, and the offering of the

flesh, we see the survival of very old ideas adapted to new needs; and the way is prepared for the Incarnation of the Son of God who is at the same time Son of man, in whom shall be fulfilled the great words of the Second Isaiah: "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin. He hath poured out His soul unto death. He was numbered with the transgressors, and He bare the sin of many. My righteous Servant shall justify many, for He shall bear their iniquities" (Isa. liii.).

The time has come for us to ask, How does the foregoing presentation of the course of evolution of the religious ideas of the later Jewish Church bear upon the problems which have come before us in these Lectures? How may we reconcile the theological with the anthropological conception of man? What truth does the old theological view of the relation of man to God, and its answer to the problems of sin and redemption, convey to us whom Anthropology and Prehistoric Archæology have taught very different conceptions of the origin of man and of his evolutionary progress on the earth? What bearing have the old doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin upon the problems of the present day, and what teaching have they for us in

the twentieth century? In the language of St. Paul we answer, "Much every way;" and this course of Lectures will have badly served its purpose if the answer we now attempt to give does not afford some help to minds that have found themselves perplexed by the apparent impossibility of reconciling ideas which at first sight seem to stand in two opposing categories. On the one hand, it is impossible any longer to hold belief in the stories of the Creation, of Adam and Eve, of the Garden of Eden, of the serpent Tempter, of the twin Trees, of "man's first disobedience and the fruit of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste brought death into the world with all our woe and loss of Eden,"—in one word, of "the Fall" and of "Original Sin" as a consequence of that definite act, and of man as belonging to a *fallen* race which needed to be *restored* to a place previously occupied but lost, and which has been thus *restored* in Christ. Moreover, we have seen how these stories arose; how they are rooted in the prehistoric conceptions of our race, and were handed down by story-tellers from generation to generation until they took their place in the Hebrew literature. We have seen that the story of the Creation in Gen. i. belongs to the very latest stratum of the Hexateuch, the Priestly Code, and that it is derived from the Babylonian conceptions of the Universe; in these the earth is supposed to have emerged

from a primeval chaos as a result of the conflict between Merodach, the god of light and order, and Tiâmat, who is Chaos personified, in which Merodach overcame; and this is merely a projecting into the far distant past, after the custom of these early thinkers, of the eternal conflict, which they saw going on before their eyes, between light and darkness, and which became a type of the equally eternal conflict between the powers of moral light and darkness, of good and evil; so that Tiâmat, the Chaos in the physical sphere, becomes the prototype of Satan in the moral sphere, and the victory of Merodach over Tiâmat typifies eventually the far-off, but sure and certain, victory of good over evil. We have seen how the later Hebrew thinkers took over this story in the days when they had already arrived at a monotheistic view of the Universe, and accordingly purified it from all taint of polytheism—although the continued use of the word *Elohim* for God points back to the primitive animistic conception of Nature which lies at the base of all later polytheistic ideas, but animism and polytheism are both negatived by the use of the verb *bara*, created, in the singular as the predicate of *Elohim* in the plural—and how God evokes an ordered Universe out of Tohû va Vohû, the Hebrew equivalent of Tiâmat, the primeval Chaos, which afterwards became equated to Tehôm, the Abyss, out of which all things sprang, and to which they return.

With the details of the six days' work and the seventh day's rest as portrayed in Gen. i. we are not concerned, except so far as they are an interesting evidence of the workings of the mind of the Hebrew sage as he pondered the mystery of the origin of things, and note how he modified the data derived from his Babylonian authority, though keeping true to the framework which it provided.

It may be noted here that it is in the priestly recension of the "Ten Words" that we find the reason given for the Sabbath rest: "Because in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day." The Ten Words, as originally promulgated, consisted, as stated previously, only of the commands such as we find them in the case of the Sixth to the Ninth Commandment, all beyond in the other Commandments being of the nature of later comments and additions; and in the case of the Fourth Commandment we are fortunate in having had the earlier Deuteronomic commentary preserved to us, in which the reason assigned refers to the deliverance from Egypt, and not to the creation.[1] That this is the correct account of the "Ten Words" follows also from the analogy of the Code of Hammurabi, king of Babylon between 2500 and 2000 B.C., with which the Hebrew legislator was no doubt acquainted.

The revelation and inspiration of Gen. i. lies in

[1] Cf. Ex. xx. 11 with Deut. v. 15.

its sublime monotheistic faith: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." In the same way we have seen that the story of Creation and the Fall; of the doings of the first descendants of Adam; of the Flood; of the Tower of Babel and of the descendants of Seth down to Abraham; and of the Patriarchs themselves down to the exodus from Egypt and the conquest of Palestine (except the framework, which belongs to P), contained in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and succeeding chapters of Genesis, belong to the earliest written document, which is itself composite, and gives us Israel's picture of the origin of the human race and of her own origin as she figured it to herself in the tenth to the eighth centuries B.C.; it was then that the stories which had long been handed down in folklore and tradition were first committed to writing by the poets, who, in writing them down, preserved the naïveté and primitive simplicity that marks all such tales, and who, while retaining clear traces of ideas common to the race in their primal outlook upon Nature and man, were yet guided by the overruling Spirit of God to convey moral and spiritual lessons of unfailing value such as no other literature possesses.

On the other hand, we have seen man as his origin is disclosed to us by the teachings of Prehistoric Archæology and Anthropology. We have seen how the first discloses him arriving on this planet at the end of a long course of evolution; at first no more

than an ape-like being, the *Pithecanthropus erectus*; then, man indeed, but rude and animal, bringing with him ideas derived from his animal ancestors, passions rooted in his nature, and religious instincts which in their origin are common to him with the higher animals from which he has sprung. We have traced him from the far-distant Eolithic days of the Tertiary Period, through the millennia of the Palæolithic Age, during the inter-glacial epochs of the Quaternary Period, down to the emergence of the present races of mankind with the commencement of the Neolithic Age, after the passing away of the last glacial epoch, and the establishing of the present order of things on the surface of the globe. We have seen him everywhere advancing from savagery through barbarism to civilisation—rapidly in more favoured districts, slowly in others, and in others not yet advanced beyond barbarism and savagery. We have seen how everywhere his religious and social instincts have followed the same line, so that it is possible, from the social condition and religious ideas of barbarous and savage races to-day, to argue as to the social condition and religious notions of our remote ancestors. We have seen that man's first outlook upon Nature is animistic—the doctrine of souls, with which is connected ancestor-worship; and that from this, when the object is no longer thought of as itself alive, but rather as the shrine of an indwelling spirit,

has sprung fetishism and polytheism, with their concomitant accompaniments of idolatry and magic. The study of the origin and course of religion among the various primitive races of the world with which he comes in contact is part of the work of every competent anthropologist at the present day—a study that is differentiated from the methods of Max Müller and his school, and from those of too many missionaries, by a sympathetic endeavour to see things as the primitive human being sees them, and to look out upon the world and man from his point of view, and the results are seen to be everywhere the same in essence, though differing in details, and are as sketched above. This should be, also, part of the training of every theologian. One of the most painstaking and sympathetic of these studies is that performed by Major A. G. Leonard, in his work on the Lower Niger and its Tribes, referred to in a previous Lecture, and we cannot do better than give here the summary of the conclusions arrived at by him, as given by Mr. A. C. Haddon in his Preface to that book; for, *mutatis mutandis*, they apply universally. "One great merit," says Mr. Haddon, "of Major Leonard's method of investigation is his appreciation of the fact that the social and religious expression of the Nature-folk is as much the direct result of their environment as is their material culture. No longer is it possible to dissociate religion from geography.

Again and again he rightly insists that religion is a natural result of human evolution, having its ultimate sources in pre-human conditions. Religion originated as the response of the emotions and dawning intelligence of man to the world around him and within him, and as in the past it served to satisfy certain human needs, so it has continued to do: sometimes widening, but at other times narrowing its scope; in some instances deepening its experience, in others becoming more and more superficial; occasionally it is stifled by convention and strangled by ritual, only to break away under the guidance of a reformer—the eternal conflict between the priest and the prophet. But the ebb and flow, periods of growth and resting stages, gradual evolution, and departure along new lines of emotion and interpretation, are all ultimately the outcome of the conditions of existence and the interactions of the human environment. Thus no phase of religious development can be understood apart from the social history of the people." Taking, *e.g.*, two widely separated regions as an illustration: "The environment of steamy, tropical West Africa is very different from that of the dry steppes and scrub of Central Australia, so it is not surprising that there is a marked contrast between the social life and religion of Negroes and Australians. The latter have to contend against a niggard earth, and, not being cultivators of the soil, they depend entirely

for their sustenance upon collecting and hunting; but even among these wandering hunters the religious sense is not lacking," as we have shown above. "Of late years evidence has been accumulating to prove the spirituality of many savage and barbaric peoples. Because the outward symbolism is usually crude, the observer assumed that the ideas that lie behind it are equally elementary and ignoble, . . . but we now know that our brethren most backward in material culture are imbued with ethical and religious ideas which do not materially differ from those inculcated by the teachers of the religions of civilised peoples." To this latter point we shall have to return presently. We note here that, as evidenced by their earliest literature, the ancestors of the Hebrew people had passed through the very same course of evolution which marks all primitive races, and we can trace the gradual progress by which, for example, Yahweh develops from being (1) a magnified man, (2) then the tribal, and (3) next the national god, until he becomes the High God *par excellence*, the Creator and Father, the one eternal God, Lord of heaven and earth; and coincidently we see the chosen men among the chosen race becoming more and more conscious of failure, of shortcoming, of sin, and more and more anxious as to the means by which a right relationship may be established between the High and Holy God and His weak and erring creature, man. In the course of this development and

its continued progress through prosperous times, and, still more, through times of adversity, until it culminates in the Person of the Christ, we behold the inspiration of the Hebrew people and of their literature, and the revelation of which, under the guiding providence of God, they were the vehicle to mankind.[1]

So, when we ask ourselves what place can be found for the old theological dogmas of the Fall and Original Sin, derived from a prosaic and literal understanding of the ancient Hebrew stories, in the human race anthropologically regarded, and what place sin, considered as a fact, and the ideas of redemption have in the anthropological view of man, we answer: The sciences of Prehistoric Archæology and Anthropology leave no room for the story of the "Fall" as it is told in Gen. iii., and theology has no need of it as a record of literal historical facts. The so-called "Fall" represents in a picture what takes place in the case of each individual human being as he emerges from the ignorance and selflessness of childhood into the self-consciousness of the adult, or rather the maturing, personality. It is connected with the awakening of the sexual instincts at the advent of puberty. And thus in every race we find this period signalised by definite ceremonies of initiation marking its significance and its importance. With the awakening of the sexual instincts comes all that train of lower passions which mark

[1] See Note A, p. 255.

man's affinity with the brute creation from which he has sprung, and which is the sign of the exchange of childish innocence for sexual knowledge, when the eyes are opened and the sense of shame springs into existence.[1] Here, in these sexual instincts and animal passions, which in themselves are perfectly natural and innocent, but which with the acquiring of self-knowledge bring with them a sense of shame unknown and unfelt before, we have what the theologian calls Original Sin, and attributes to the Fall, but which the anthropologist, in language more familiar to, and intelligible to, the "man in the street," calls "hereditary tendencies," or "heredity"; and it is just here that Weismann's doctrine comes in so appositely; for it is these very instincts and passions that belong pre-eminently to, and are handed on from generation to generation through, the germ-plasm, which is continuous and unchanged throughout the race.

Thus sin is, in its essence, the hereditary tendency or bias towards evil, *i.e.* wrong-doing, through the infraction or abuse of laws implanted in their very nature, of a race advancing towards perfection but not yet perfect. We have seen man struggling upward from savagery through barbarism to civilisation, and every stage is marked by an increase in the catalogue of actions which so far as they subtend the idea of God are sins, and so far as they concern

[1] Cf. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, pp. 286, 287.

man's social relations are crimes, until they come to include not merely outward objective acts, but acts of the will, sins of thought as well as word and deed.[1]

"The doctrine of Original Sin, then, is the expression of a profound psychological truth. We have, first, the hesitation involved in the development of consciousness generally; secondly, we see from savage custom and other psychological facts, not only the idea of the possibility of disobeying nature, or the supernatural sanction of taboo, or the Supreme Being, but also the notion that sin is closely connected with certain functions, a notion half reflex and accidental, and half the result of the affirmation of life and its sources. In the Christian doctrine" (as it has been deduced from the old Hebrew story) "the original sin of our first parents has been generalised as disobedience, but its quality is perhaps sexual; it is concerned at least with the animal part of our nature, and may well be regarded as inherent in our flesh and blood. There is thus in the old theological doctrine a curious glimpse of biological theory, and the process of eliminating original sin coincides with human evolution—*the elimination of the monkey from man.*" So writes Mr. Crawley, in his book, *The Tree of Life*, p. 294. In other words, it is the continuous mastery of our inherited tendencies in the conquest of the lower nature as man progresses upward in the

[1] See Note B, p. 258.

moral and spiritual sphere, and becomes more and more truly man, and less and less of the purely animal remains to be eliminated.

Thus, as Mr. Crawley also says, "the story of Eden is a real psychological document," and the experience therein portrayed repeats itself from generation to generation. The real seat of sin is in the will, which is free either to obey or disobey the impulses of good, and the whole meaning and purpose of religion in every race is to strengthen the impulses towards that which is good—good for the race, and good for the individual, both personally and as a member of a society to which he is bound in indissoluble bonds.

To quote Mr. Crawley again: "The Christian doctrine of sin is well put by Gore in that aspect of it which we have been considering. 'It is common to all the anti-Christian views of sin that at the last resort they make sin natural, a part of nature. It is characteristic of Christ's view of sin —of the scriptural view of it—that it makes it unnatural. It is characteristic, again, of the non-Christian view that it makes the body, the material, the seat of sin. It is essential to the Christian view to find its seat and only source in the will.' Now this account applies exactly to the primitive conception: the savage, like the Essene," and, we may add, like the authors of the story of the Fall, "regards sin as a transgression of nature. Sin

breaks taboo, and is so far, in Lang's happy phrase, a 'mystic misdeed.' But the taboo is intended to preserve the integrity of human nature, to keep intact the sources of life. Sin is thus essentially a violation of what is absolutely sacred ; inasmuch as it is a perversion of the will, and a corruption of the vital instinct, which is the source of religion, sin is a crime against life."[1]

It is essential that we keep this thought clearly in mind, because it is here that, although we are looking at the subject now wholly from the anthropological standpoint, and not in regard to the Person and work of the Christ, that we part company entirely from that which arrogates to itself the name of the "New Theology." However much we may respect the aims of the promulgator of its tenets, which are not new but very old, being practically only Pelagianism in a new dress, we must emphasise that he takes a wholly inadequate view of sin. Sin, as we have seen, is something positive, not a mere negative—the shadow cast by goodness. Sin is indeed, as he states, selfishness,—the undue assertion of the individual and his supposed interests against the interests of the community, which are in their totality the expression of the will of God,—but it derives its origin from positive tendencies rooted in the race, the outcome of which in act needs forgiveness, and

[1] Crawley, *Tree of Life*, p. 295.

the power of which needs to be overcome. This inadequacy of the views of the New Theology in respect of sin, and what may be called the Christian view, is well expressed by Dr. Robertson Nicoll in a recent number of the *British Weekly*, and as expressing the views of an eminent Nonconformist may be fittingly compared with the statement we have quoted above from Bishop Gore:[1]—

"It is a sound Christian instinct which has led so many critics of the New Theology to fasten on its attitude towards sin as a test of its real character. Paradoxical as it may seem to say so, the doctrine of sin is, in the strictest sense of the words, a Christian doctrine. It is only the Christian conscience which can tell what sin is, and the truth about it is vital because with it stands or falls the truth about all that is most real and dear in Christian experience. Faith in Christ, when we go to the very core of it, means faith in the sin-forgiving love of a holy God; the kingdom of God, in which the Christian realises his salvation, is a kingdom of redeemed sinners. . . . At the present moment many people are looking through the other end of the telescope. They are taking a view of the phenomena of sin from which God, so to speak, is excluded. The dominant idea in their minds, the category which rules all their instinctive intellectual movements, is not God, but Nature.

[1] And see Note C, p. 259.

Man is part of the great system of Nature, and the explanation of all the phenomena of human life, including those which theology has called sin, must, like that of all phenomena whatever, be sought within the system. In some sense, sin must be natural. It must have its place and function in the natural order. It must be incidental to development, analogous in one part of man's nature to what in another part of it are called growing pains; it is present not that we may despair about it, or bring groundless accusations against ourselves, but because it is contributory in some way to a fuller life which is yet to be. . . . It must be admitted that the older Protestant theology, preoccupied as it was with the universality of sin, took too little account of degrees of responsibility—and we are paying for that oversight now. Such omissions have always to be made good sooner or later, and Churches should therefore be careful not to sow the seeds of future trouble by hasty and peremptory decisions on complex doctrinal questions. But to ignore differences of degree in presence of the one overwhelming fact was a nobler and more hopeful error than, under the pressure of considerations which do not come from the moral world at all, to deny the validity of the ideas and experiences by which that world, as we know it, is constituted. . . . Scientific men may have an interest in dis-

cussing what qualities are or are not transmissible, but for the moralist or the philosopher the question is not vital. Such as we are we are born into the world, and our whole nature is our inheritance. If a man says he is not responsible for his nature because he has inherited it—it is not, strictly speaking, his nature at all, but the nature of his kind—it is a fair question to ask him, For what, then, do you take responsibility? The responsibility may no doubt be lighter or heavier according to circumstances which it is beyond our power to calculate, but such as it is, light or heavy, a man's inherited nature is the field on which he has to assume it. It is there he has to fight with beasts or with devils, and to fight for his life. It is his nature, the constitution he was born with, of which he had to take up the responsibility; to decline to do so is to decline to be a man."

In one sense, indeed, sin is "natural," for it is the inevitable outcome of the nature which man derives from his animal ancestry, just as the first dawnings of religion in man may be traced to that same pre-human ancestry. But what is natural to the animal and no sin—for whatever the actions or passions of an animal it is impossible to attribute sin to it—is unnatural to man in so far as he is "man" and has risen to a higher stage in the ladder of evolution. The reason lies here: that an animal is unconscious of itself, it has no personality; it is not a person,

and therefore has no responsibility; but it is not an automaton; for animals, certainly the higher animals, have freedom of choice as to whether they will do this or that, but not self-conscious will. Man, on the other hand, so soon as he *is* man, is conscious of himself, he has a personality, he is a person and therefore is responsible. He has freedom of will, he may choose to contravene the true laws of his being, which in him include social as well as personal relationships, and if he does so, he sins against himself, against his fellows, and against God. This is the truth which the poet-thinker of Israel intended in his naïve and childlike fashion to convey when he narrates in the oldest Hebrew story that "Yahweh breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul;" and what the priestly philosopher of the first chapter of Genesis intends in his more deeply reasoned statement when he says, "Elohim created man in his own image, in the image of Elohim created he him."

The whole subject of the origin and propagation of sin has been very ably treated in his Hulsean Lectures under that title by the Rev. F. R. Tennant, and to those Lectures I would refer the student; but in one respect I think he has misapprehended the real argument as to the bearing of the teachings of Biology with regard to heredity on the question of the theological doctrine of Original Sin. He emphasises the point, against which I must once

more enter a protest, that sin is something foreign to man's nature, introduced from outside by a definite act on the part of the early progenitors of the race in the past, and then argues for its transmission as an "acquired quality" from generation to generation, and he bases his presumption of the possibility of this on the supposition that Weismann's theory of the non-transmission of "acquired qualities" is not as yet a universally accepted biological fact. Even granting that this were so—and we have shown in a previous Lecture that the consensus of biological opinion is in favour of the truth of Weismann's theory—it is a mistake to argue at all, from the anthropological standpoint, that sin is an acquired quality. As we have shown above, what partakes of the quality of sin in man is rooted in his nature as derived from his animal ancestry; and, as belonging to the race, transmitted from generation to generation through the germ-plasm, which is continuous, it constitutes an hereditary tendency, or theologically, Original Sin; as belonging to the individual, *i.e.*, the soma-plasm, and taking effect in action, whether of thought, word, or deed, due to environment acting on heredity, it becomes actual sin. The advantage of our statement of the matter is that it is in harmony both with the most probably ascertained facts of Biology and with the data derived from Anthropology.

Thus, as we study the psychology of the lower

races and mark the development of their religious ideas until we pass on to races that have emerged, with many vestiges of primitive notions, and many survivals of primitive customs such as exist even among ourselves, into larger and wider regions of thought, we see man, in the persons of his higher representatives, ever struggling upward; and the sense of imperfection, of sin, as inherited tendency and actual wrongdoing, the fruit of heredity and environment, becomes ever more acute in the more advanced races. Some of the Babylonian hymns and prayers breathe an almost Hebraic sense of sin and shortcoming and a longing for redemption, as do also many of the ancient Vedic poems, and the prayers that were uttered by the Mexicans and Peruvians; and a similar sense of sin is found expressed in tones more of despair than of hope in the prayers of the Greek and Roman pagan ritual and in the words of the philosophers, particularly of the Stoic school.

But it was reserved for one race to carry onward both the sense of sin and of the means whereby sin itself may be both atoned for and forgiven and overcome, to a point never attained by any other race; in this lies its justification to the claim to be the "chosen people," and its history and its literature are, for that reason, the inspired history and literature of an inspired people. It is this looking at the matter from the Godward side; from the

manward side we may say that this race had an innate faculty for the highest achievements of the religious consciousness; from whichever side we look at it, it is the work of the immanent Spirit of the transcendent God which was and is ever at work everywhere in every race and in every individual of mankind; but which specially manifested itself in this race in the line of the inspired prophets, ay, and in the priestly ritual and sacrifices both of the earlier days and of the second Temple, preparing the way for God's last and greatest Revelation in the manifestation of Himself in the Person of the Christ, the Eternal Word of the Father, the Archetype and Head of humanity veiled in human flesh, who "for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven." In the words of the inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "God who in divers fashions and in many portions spake unto the fathers in the prophets hath in these last days spoken unto us in His Son whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds." The God-inspired prophets of Israel showed the futility of all man's efforts after goodness unless he could look for forgiveness for failure and help towards the perfecting of his nature from God Himself; the God-inspired ritual and sacrifices of the Temple displayed the methods of God's forgiveness and the means whereby strength to

rise higher might be obtained; and so both alike led up to the Person and work of the incarnate Christ, the help of the Holy Spirit, and the sacramental life of the Church.

The view of humanity which has been put forth in these Lectures will, no doubt, appear at first sight strange and unwonted to minds which have been theologically trained; but it is a view necessitated by the facts of science, and should therefore be welcomed both by the theologian and the religiously disposed scientist, because it offers a readjustment of ideas between theology and science which is in harmony with the latter and not opposed to the absolutely necessary conceptions of the former, and may therefore be accounted in the nature of an eirenicon between two otherwise opposing and divergent forces. There may have been among those who followed as they were delivered, and there will assuredly be among those who read these imperfect and inadequate, because all too brief, expositions of what I believe to be the only lines on which a view of mankind that is consonant with science and not out of harmony with a true theology can be pursued to-day, many who are more familiar with the facts of Biology, and with the sciences of Astronomy and Geology, Prehistoric Archæology and Anthropology than I have been able to make myself in the midst

of a busy and otherwise occupied parochial life, and they may have been tempted to give more attention to Haeckel's system of materialistic Monism, which seems to furnish a ready-made solution of the problems which may be summed up under the title of *The Riddle of the Universe*, than it deserves, and I would ask them to pursue their studies with an open mind, and, while giving its due effect to every fact revealed by science, not lightly to throw away those supports of the higher life and incentives to a nobler outlook which are furnished by religion. There may be, on the other hand, some among them who tremble at what they are inclined to call the introduction of "the thin end of the wedge," and who in their fear for the inner sanctuary of religion would cling to all the outposts which have been erected by the presuppositions and prejudices of a theology which looked out upon the Universe with far other eyes than ours, and endeavoured to solve the riddles of existence and the mysteries of sin and suffering by paying attention to man apart from his origin and environment, and by the setting up of a system marvellously complete and self-contained, but which the facts of science have proved, "like the cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces," to be but "the baseless fabric of a vision" and a dream, which at the first touch of reality is destined to vanish into nothingness, and I would ask

them too to pursue their studies with an open mind, to put away all prejudices and presuppositions, and to believe that in this restatement of the case, although much that they had been led to value may have disappeared, yet much, and that the only thing that really matters, the only thing that is of essential and eternal significance, remains.

With the disappearance of the notion of mankind as a "fallen" race it might at first sight appear that the need for redemption, for grace and the means of grace, disappeared too. But a deeper study and a more profound research show that this is not so. The Incarnation of the Son of God—the redemption wrought, the forgiveness won, the grace bestowed—was in the mind and purpose of God from all eternity; all the gropings and upward longings, the religious sentiments and ceremonial observances of primitive man, and all the revelation, the special inspiration of the Spirit of God, bestowed on Israel, were meant to lead up to the Christ, the God-man incarnate, the Head and King of a redeemed and perfected humanity. That the work was accomplished in and for a race which began its career in the non-moral stage in the far distant past, and only slowly acquired a sense of sin as the moral law became slowly revealed in the advance of mankind from a tribal and social to an individual personality, only enhances our ideas of the eternal purpose of the glorious God who is at once transcendent above, apart

from and, in the infinity of His Being, over against the Universe which He has made, and yet is one with and immanent in it, the guiding Force and directing Spirit of the souls which He has called into existence, and this enables us in some degree to understand the sublime intuition of St. Paul that it was His will from all eternity "to sum up all things in the Christ."

In Him, through the Incarnation, the chain which bound the race to its hereditary tendencies is broken, and redemption is secured through the solidarity of the race of whose nature He partook, and which, in virtue of the Incarnation, is united to Him, and in Him to God.

This union is sealed to each individual of the race in the holy Sacrament of Baptism, confirmed in the Laying on of Hands, and maintained through participation in the blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood. Herein lies the power of an endless life, the sacramental life which is the portion of each of the redeemed in His Church.

Thus the Christ is the last and unique Revelation of God, the culmination of the progressive revelation of the Old Testament, the Perfect Man.

Sacramentally united to Him, who is the Archetype of the race, man overcomes the evil tendencies inherent in the germ-plasm, and the temptations which come to him individually through the soma-plasm; he conquers heredity and environment, and becomes capable of an endless progress towards perfection.

What the God-guided impulses of primitive man ordained, what the savage aims at in the rites of initiation, the common eating of the sacrifice slain to procure communion between the god and his worshipper, and in the blood-brotherhood with his god and with his fellows secured thereby, what Israel found in circumcision and sacrifice, that is really bestowed in Baptism, Confirmation, and Communion. Those were but the shadows of the true; the foreshadowings and adumbrations, and gropings after the things which are alone eternally real and valid.[1] The Christ, in His earthly life, in His dealings with sinners, and in His teaching, was the last of the Prophets; in His death upon the cross He was the last of the Priests, and the last, because the one all-Sufficient and all-prevailing sacrifice. That Sacrifice, because it is the death of the Incarnate God, and the grandest display of self-sacrifice, the crucifying of the fleshly impulses and the selfish will to live in obedience to a higher and a nobler law, is the redemption of mankind; and Christians are an initiated people, the new race, the people of God not for themselves, but for the whole race. Thus we may see the meaning and work of the Church—the highest expression of God's purposes for mankind. It is sometimes said that the sacramental system of the Church is nothing but pure fetishism. We accept the phrase. It is fetishism — but

[1] See Note D, p. 264.

fetishism raised to the *n*th degree—*i.e.*, it is the consummation of, and by its means is really and validly bestowed on the faithful Christian, all that fetishism groped after and implied. In separating themselves from the Church's system, and aiming at what they consider a more spiritual Christianity divorced from material adjuncts and aids, our Nonconformist brethren are depriving themselves of that in which alone the true Christian life consists. Emphasising individualism and denying or ignoring the social solidarity of mankind which is secured in the Church, they are in danger of losing all real spirituality, as may be seen by the vagaries of the "New Theology," and the transforming of the Nonconformist bodies from religious into purely political corporations.[1]

So for us there is no fear of the new and enlarged view of human nature, and of the length of time during which our race has existed on the globe, which is supplied by Prehistoric Archæology and Anthropology. Each baptized, confirmed soul must fight, must struggle, must press on, forward and upward, must seek the grace imparted and the strength given in communion with Him whom God has given to be "Head over all things to His Church, which is His Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all," "until we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of

[1] See Note E, p. 265.

Christ." So struggling, so fighting, so pressing on, we can possess our souls in patience, and await the dawning of the perfect day when "the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God."[1]

To conclude with the eloquent words of a great teacher: "Though fierce travails, though wide seas and roaring gulfs lie before us, is it not something if a Loadstar in the eternal sky do once more disclose itself; an everlasting light, shining through all cloud-tempests and roaring billows, ever as we emerge from the trough of the sea: the blessed beacon, far off on the edge of far horizons, towards which we are to steer incessantly for life? Is it not something; O Heavens, is it not all? There lies the Heroic promised land; under that Heaven's light, my brethren, bloom the Happy Isles,—there, O there! Thither will we;

'There dwells the great Achilles whom we knew.'

There dwell all Heroes, and will dwell: thither all ye heroic-minded!—The Heaven's Loadstar once clearly in our eye, how will each true man stand truly to *his* work in the ship; how with undying hope will all things be fronted, all be conquered. . . . The Past is a dim indubitable fact: the Future too is one, only dimmer; nay properly it is the *same* fact in new dress and development. For the Present holds in it

[1] See Note F, p. 267.

both the whole Past and the whole Future;—as the LIFE-TREE IGDRASIL, wide-waving, many toned, has its roots down deep in the Death-kingdoms, among the oldest dead dust of men, and with its boughs reaches always beyond the stars; and in all times and places is one and the same Life-tree!"[1]

NOTE A, p. 236.

Professor Otto Pfleiderer, in his recent book on *Primitive Christianity*, shows very clearly that the Apostle St. Paul's theology, especially his doctrine as to the Natural Man, Redemption, and Life in the Spirit, and therefore, of course, to a larger extent than is generally recognised, the theology of the Church, is based ultimately upon primitive animistic beliefs. From these arise his conceptions as to the conflict between the Body and Soul, *i.e.* the Flesh and Spirit; the efficacy of Christ's Sacrifice; and the life of the Believer "in the Spirit"; from this, too, the efficacy of Sacraments, as the Christian *mysteries*, and Means of Grace. In this respect St. Paul is the true author of the Sacramental System of the Church.

Here it will suffice to quote: "If the question is asked what are the sources or the affinities of Pauline anthropology in general, it must be said that it is neither Hellenistic philosophy nor Pharisaic theology, but a Christian modification of the popular anthropology which was common to the whole of antiquity, and which we usually call

[1] Carlyle, *Past and Present*, bk. i. c. 6.

Animism, according to which the soul or spirit is a generally invisible, yet not wholly immaterial being, which stands in so loose a relationship to the body as its containing vessel that it can at times pass out of it (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2), just as other spiritual beings can temporarily or permanently enter into it and dwell in it. The view of sin especially, as a demonic power, a spiritual being which dwells in the material body, which rouses the passions, enslaves the will, and causes death, corresponds exactly to the fundamental animistic view according to which all abnormal excitations of the soul life, whether in a good, or more especially, in a bad sense, are referred to the overmastering influence of spiritual beings who take possession of man."

Again: "According to this theory, all extraordinary phenomena in the life of Nature and of man are due to the influence of spirits, or living creatures at once supersensible and sensible, which are not indeed bound by the limits of the gross, visible, corporeal world, but are not, on that account, wholly immaterial, but possess a finer, usually invisible corporeity, as is evidenced by the fact that the word for spirit in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin is identical with, or closely related to, the word for wind or breath." Professor Pfleiderer then describes the ideas of Philo and of Seneca, and points out how for St. Paul the multitude of spirits are all condensed, so to say, or concentrated in the *one* "Spirit of God," which is equated with the "Spirit of Christ," for "the Lord is the Spirit"; and this is manifested in the virtuous life of the Christian, which is the test

of the so-called miraculous gifts. And he continues: "The relationship of these theories with the Pauline doctrine of the Spirit is so striking that one might feel tempted to suppose dependence on the one side or the other. And yet that would not be true. Their affinity is merely due to the fact that these ideas were then in the air, and answered to a religious need which was felt at the same time in different quarters." And further: "The explanation of it (*i.e.*, St. Paul's system) is to be found simply in the fact that the apostle had no other forms at command for the expression of his Christian experiences than the animistic conceptions of ancient supernaturalism, which hypostatised extraordinary phenomena of consciousness as spiritual beings. When we have once recognised that the ground of the difficulty lies in the form of representation which was inevitable at that period, we can the more easily, abstracting from this, grasp and rejoice in the abiding kernel of the Pauline ethic. It is certain that Paul by his teaching laid the theological foundation of a new ethical system, which gives man the strongest bond of union, of solidarity, of moral order—love, which, taking root in the pious heart, draws ever new nourishment from religious faith and hope, and finds the norm which it must seek to realise in the highest ideal, in God and His Son."[1]

Professor Wernle, likewise, in his *Beginnings of Christianity*, shows how the first Christian theology is based on popular animistic conceptions, although

[1] Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, i. 289, 290, 370, 376, 408, 409.

he describes the fact without employing the term. Thus he commences by saying: "It is no doubt true that Christianity is a daughter of the Jewish faith; yet it strikes its roots deep down into a soil which we may call beliefs common to all the religions of antiquity. In that soil the characteristic features of the various religions of the ancient world are not as yet distinguishable. Among these common beliefs may be included the whole body of ideas concerning the earth, nature, man, the soul and the world of spirits. Before the dawn of science these popular ideas bore undisputed sway, and they live on even to the present time engaged in a ceaseless struggle with scientific conceptions of the universe."[1]

NOTE B, p. 238.

Just as in the case of every child there comes a time when it awakes from the innocent unconsciousness of childhood to the consciousness of the difference between right and wrong, and to the knowledge that, as a matter of practical experience, it is free to choose, and that on its choice praise or blame depends, so in the course of the evolution of the human race there came a time, how early we know not, when the like consciousness arose, and, under the guidance of God, it is probable that the system of taboo, established in the primitive aggregations of families and tribes, played a leading part.

This is implied in the narrative of Gen. iii., where

[1] Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, i. p. 1; and see Weinel, *St. Paul: The Man and his Work, etc.*, pp. 113–123.

the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge is taboo to the primal pair, and it is all that is necessary for us to hold as Christian believers and students of Anthropology. The subtleties indulged in by Professor Bernard in his article on the subject of "The Fall" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and indeed by Canon Driver in his commentary on Gen. iii. in *The Book of Genesis*, pp. 56, 57, go beyond what is needful, and are, so far, more likely to confuse than to help. The paragraph commencing, "Of the actual beginnings of man upon this earth we know nothing," on p. 54 of the last mentioned book, is excellent and cannot be improved upon, as is also the summary statement on "The Antiquity of Man," pp. xxxvii–xlii.

NOTE C, p. 241.

Mr. Campbell's doctrine of sin is confused. In one passage he is practically a Platonist: "Evil is a negative, not a positive term, . . . good is being, evil is not being," etc. In another passage he is as really an out-and-out Pantheist: "Life *is* God. And when the tendency goes round and works havoc in the world, it still remains a quest for God, although a blundering one;" upon which follow the celebrated illustrations from the drunkard and the *roué* in Piccadilly, who are both seeking life and therefore God. And yet again he is the Christian preacher denouncing the love of self in every class and every society: "Sin is the murder-spirit in human experience."

But the fountain-head of Mr. Campbell's difficulties

lies, as it must do in the case of every thinking man, in the mistaken ideas about the Fall, which have been made the foundation of the whole Christian doctrine of sin, and in what he says in the following passage I entirely concur: "The theological muddle is largely caused by the inability of many people to free themselves from archaic notions which have really nothing to do with Christianity, although they have been imported into it. The principal of these, in relation to the question of sin, is the doctrine of the Fall. This doctrine has played a mischievous part in Christian thought, more especially, perhaps, since the Reformation."

Upon this I will quote the remarks of a writer in the *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1907, which exactly express the point of view that I am endeavouring to put before the readers of these Lectures.

After pointing out that the theology of the Fall hardly appears in the Old Testament, that it has left hardly any traces, if any at all, in the Gospels, and that it does not in reality form the actual basis of the theology of St. Paul even in the Epistle to the Romans, where not the Fall of Man but the fact of sin is at the foundation of his teaching, while the story of the Fall is only alluded to in two places, both very obscure, the writer continues:—

"At the present time there is, and there is rightly, a reaction against some of the extremer forms of the Reformation doctrine. Both Biblical criticism and the study of ethnology"—he should have added, Anthropology—"make it impossible for most people to believe in the story of the Fall as a historical fact.

A one-sided conception of the meaning of evolution makes a large number of people desire to construct a theory of life which shall have no place in it for any fall of man. But none of these changes in thought and none of these theories do away with the actual facts which have made people in the past believe in sin, and which led to such speculations as those concerning the origin of evil. No theory of evolution can explain away facts, and the fact, so far as we can see, is this—that man alone amongst created beings has the gift of conscious knowledge" (we might ask how this "knowledge" could be unconscious!) "of right and wrong, the power of choosing right and rejecting wrong, and that he has often chosen the wrong and rejected the right. The result of this has been that state of mankind which we call sinful. . . . And our knowledge about sin is not confined to what we see. It is a fact of our own personal experience"—the power of which and the blessedness of escape from which was expressed for all time by the Psalmists of Israel in such inspired utterances as we find in Pss. xxxii. and li.

Lastly, as summing up the *raison d'être* of Mr. Campbell's position as a revolt from and yet the outcome of individualistic Protestantism and the upholding of the sole authority of the Bible—an authority now proved insufficient and non-existent —I will quote the writer's concluding remarks. "What is to be our authority? The Bible has gone in the sense of a final authority. But this is not new. The result of the newest criticism is only to continue a process which Erasmus began. . . . The higher

criticism does not overthrow the Bible: it only introduces another and we believe a more rational method of interpreting it. It has made the problems of the Old Testament very much less difficult; it brings out its reality and spiritual religion. It is only to those to whom the Bible has been the one, only, final authority that the difficulty is really serious. But the Church of England has always laid down in her many formulæ, in one way or another, that the Christian faith is older than the New Testament. 'The New Testament was the *product* of this faith, not its foundation. . . .'[1]

"In the authority of the Church as interpreting Scripture and as controlled by Scripture we can, in the present day, find a quite adequate basis of belief."

The problems of the age and its difficulties are much enhanced by the fact that "the inadequate conception of 'Churches' has taken the place of the Church as a great ideal. . . .Mr. Campbell fails because he starts as an individualist—and shall we say as a Protestant?—and not with the life of corporate Christianity behind him. . . . The clever critic fails, as he always will fail, because he has no reverence. The solution of the problems that Mr. Campbell raises will always be more adequate and true the more the thinker is Catholic and not merely Protestant."—*Church Quarterly Review*, July 1907, pp. 418–22, 431–35.

Compare also the following:—

"Two ways of regarding Christianity, which the Reformers inherited from the Middle Ages and

[1] Walker, *What about the New Theology?* p. 18.

retained, have had on subsequent ages a sad influence. The first of these was an unhistoric and uncritical way of regarding the Bible. Driven to produce some authority which could be put in the balances against the authority of the visible Church, to what could men appeal but to Scripture? And accepting the Holy Scriptures as an inspired and infallible authority, they accepted them *as a whole*. . . .

"The greatest by far of all the troubles and dangers at present threatening the reformed Churches arises from the fact that their founders made an inspired and infallible Bible the corner-stone of their systems. The growth of historic criticism, whatever be in the long run the gain that it will bring, is at the moment sapping the foundations on which *these* Churches were built.

"The second of the great misfortunes of the Reformers was that they often regarded Christianity as a body of opinions rather than a way of life. . . . They looked on the Fourth Gospel as just as valuable historically as the other three; and they accepted the Pauline Epistles as of the same authority as the teaching of Jesus Himself. . . . Hence the importance attached to the drawing up of confessions; . . . the bitter quarrels of Lutherans and Calvinists; the burning of Servetus and the splitting up of the Church of England."—Gardner, *Growth of Christianity*, pp. 229, 230.[1]

[1] See Note on p. 270.

NOTE D, p. 252.

"The religion of the Niger delta natives is based on the adoration of ancestral spirits, materially represented by emblems, the latter being nothing more nor less than convenient forms of embodiment, which can be altered or transferred according to circumstances. These objects, rude and senseless as they may be, are regarded as vehicles of spiritual influence, as something sacred because of their direct association with some familiar and powerful spirit, and not as objects which in themselves have, or carry with them, any so-called supernatural powers. It is not the object itself, but what is in the object, that is the power for good or for evil. Hence, though they may venerate the object itself, they do so only because of the spirit which resides in or is associated with it. The object accordingly becomes nothing more nor less than a sacred receptacle, and its holiness is merely a question of association. The thing itself is helpless and powerless; it cannot do harm, just as it cannot do good; the spirit which is invariably ancestral, even when deified, alone does the mischief or wreaks the vengeance in the case of iniquity or neglect, or confers the benefits and blessings when the ancestral rites are performed with due piety by the household. The insignificance of the object is of no consequence, nay, rather, the greater is its insignificance, the greater the reflected glory and power of the spirit. This is the essence of fetishism."[1]

[1] Leonard, *Lower Niger and its Tribes*, Preface (by Dr. Haddon), p. xii.

Yes, and can a better description be given, *mutatis mutandis*, of the sacramental system of the Church? There we have the insignificance of the object, common water, the freest and fullest of God's gifts, common bread and wine, the most universal necessities of life, but sanctified, made holy, because of the spirit which resides in or is associated with them. Baptism in which water is sanctified by the Spirit of God to the purifying of the soul; bread and wine which are made by Divine power the means of communion with the risen and glorified Christ—really bestowing those life-giving and life-sustaining blessings which the savage, and primitive man, dimly grope after.

NOTE E, p. 253.

"Religion," says Mr. Chatterton-Hill in his book on *Heredity and Selection in Sociology*, "is still a force in Society which has not yet lost all its old vitality. And if the religious spirit has survived all the storms and all the attacks which have been directed against it; if those who are most eager, either to supersede it by some new Positivist ideal, or to weaken it in one way or another, are compelled finally to arrive at the very point they were seeking to avoid; . . . if every great philosopher who seeks to give a value to the ideal of life, is forced to go beyond life in order to find that value; after all this, we may reasonably see in the *besoin de croire*, as Brunetière has called it, in the 'need to believe,' some justification for the view that *religion is a sociological necessity*."

Now, "religious idealism can only hope to be a

social force in proportion as it is embodied in a coherent organisation, . . . and the only organisation *capable of constituting a spiritual organisation of idealistic and supra-rational principles adequate to the needs of Western civilisation* is the Catholic Church."

The writer, probably, means by this the Roman Catholic Church; but for us in England there is an organisation of ancient foundation, but of greater freedom, based on apostolic lines, and appealing to the nation as no other body of Christians can. I mean the Catholic reformed mother Church of England, and, as applying to her, I accept the statement without any reservation.

"Religious belief," he goes on, "corresponds to the necessities of the emotional nature, even as science corresponds to the necessities of the intellect. . . . The intellectual nature of man finds adequate satisfaction in science; the emotional nature of man can find such satisfaction only in religious belief. . . .

"Alike from the purely individual point of view of the expansion of the emotional nature, and from the larger sociological point of view of social integration and stability, religion is a necessary factor in human life. In truth these two points of view are in reality one. Religious belief is a sociological necessity; and to fulfil its indispensable social functions, this belief must be incarnated in an organisation which is truly social in its nature. The stability of the social structure is dependent on the security of its spiritual foundation."[1]

[1] Vide *op. cit.*, pp. 504–538; and cf. Headley, *Problems of Evolution*, pp. 281–316, particularly pp. 290–293.

NOTE F, p. 254.

"Both the idea of sacramental worship and the forms under which it is performed by the Christian Church are the almost universal heritage of mankind. The symbolic uses of washing and eating are the most natural, the simplest, and the most widely diffused of all such ceremonies. So natural are they, that we may say with some confidence that if Christ had not instituted Baptism and the Eucharist the Church would have had to invent them. A Christianity without sacraments could never have converted Europe. In fact, the two great sacraments were almost the only Christian rites which answered to the ancient idea of religion as *cultus*—as the performance of some prescribed form of service to the Deity. . . .

"The need of sacraments has been universally felt both by savage and civilised mankind. It has been met everywhere in much the same way—by attributing a mysterious efficacy to certain prescribed symbolical acts, which are generally chosen from the simplest and commonest functions of ordinary life, such as washing and eating. The special boons which the worshippers expect to obtain by these ceremonies are the goodwill and protection of the Deity, the forgiveness of their sins, the acquisition of Divine grace by mystical union with God, and the consecration of human bonds of brotherhood by the solemn communion of every member of the society in the presence of God. . . .

"And the Christian sacraments are real vehicles or instruments of grace. . . . The Christian, when he

receives Baptism or Holy Communion, pledges himself to make his life a living sacrifice to God; he transacts the forms, ordained, as he believes, by Christ Himself, by which that pledge is ratified on his part, and by which the promised grace is confirmed to him by God. The sacraments are not magical formulæ which the spirits must obey" (as was very largely the belief of the post-apostolic Church, under the influence of animistic ideas, which were then still living beliefs in the case of the vast mass of those to whom the message of the Church came); "but they are 'means by which we receive' real and great spiritual benefits. If we probe the mystery to the bottom, we find that it is really part of a mystery which environs us in all the circumstances of our life, and which is by no means peculiar to acts of worship. . . . For myself, I believe that Gregory of Nyssa was right when he said that 'Christianity has its strength in the mystic symbols.'"[1]—*Contentio Veritatis*, "The Sacraments," by Dr. W. R. Inge, pp. 279, 284–85, 297–99, and consult the whole essay, which is very clearly and thoughtfully reasoned out. Cf. the corresponding paper in *Lux Mundi*, by the present Bishop of Oxford; and see Gardner, *Growth of Christianity*, pp. 131–136.

[1] "Two streams of religious tendency meet in Christianity," say the Germans, "the *Sacramental* (mystical, *magical*) and the *Spiritual*: and the former in winning has killed the latter; hence the divergence between the Catholic and Protestant type of mind." But is it so in reality? *Words* themselves are but *symbols*, and the Spirit of God in Nature and in the soul of man works only through *means*: *i.e.*, the Spirit must have a body to work upon and to manifest itself in.

ADDITIONAL NOTE, pp. 219–221.

The following extract from Dr. J. G. Frazer's *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, puts in a very striking and graphic manner ideas similar to those expressed in the text:—

"The great prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries by the spiritual ideals and the ethical fervour of their teaching had wrought a religious and moral reform perhaps unparalleled in history. Under their influence an austere monotheism had replaced the old sensuous worship of the natural powers: a stern Puritanical spirit, an unbending rigour of mind had succeeded to the old easy supple temper with its weak compliances, its wax-like impressionability, its proclivities to the sins of the flesh. And the moral lessons which the prophets inculcated were driven home by the political events of the time. . . . The long agony of the siege of Samaria must have been followed with trembling anxiety by the inhabitants of Judæa. . . . Its final fall and the destruction of the northern kingdom could not fail to fill every thoughtful mind in the sister realm with sad forebodings. It was as if the sky had lowered and thunder muttered over Jerusalem. Thenceforth to the close of the Jewish monarchy, about a century and a half later, the cloud never passed away, though once for a little it seemed to lift, when Sennacharib raised the siege of Jerusalem, and the watchers on the walls beheld the last of the long line of spears and standards disappearing, the last squadron of the blue-coated

Assyrian cavalry, sweeping in a cloud of dust, out of sight. (Ezek. xxiii. 5 *sq.*, 12.)

"It was in this period of national gloom and despondency that the two great reformations of Israel's religion were accomplished, the first by King Hezekiah, the second a century later by King Josiah. We need not wonder then that the reformers who in that and subsequent ages composed or edited the annals of their nation should have looked as sourly on the old unreformed paganism of their forefathers as the fierce zealots of the Commonwealth looked on the far more innocent pastimes of Merry England; and that in their zeal for the glory of God they should have blotted many pages of history lest they should perpetuate the memory of practices to which they traced the calamities of their country. All the historical books passed through the office of the Puritan censor (*i.e.*, the Deuteronomic redactor), and we can hardly doubt that they emerged from it stripped of many gay feathers which they had flaunted when they went in."—Frazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 20–22.

NOTE, p. 263.

In reference to what is said on p. 260, cf. Professor Armstrong in his address to section L. of the British Association at Belfast, 1902. "To use the apt words of the Master quoted by the Poet at the Breakfast-table: 'if for the Fall of Man science comes to substitute the Rise of Man, it means the utter disintegration of all the spiritual pessimisms which have been like a spasm in the heart, and a cramp in the intellect of men for so many centuries.'"

APPENDICES

I. The Higher Criticism and Christian Teaching.

II. The Higher Criticism and the Miraculous.

III. Frames of Mind.

IV. Reasons for signing the "Declaration on Biblical Criticism" contained in a letter to the *Standard*, May, 1905.

I.

How far do the Results of the Higher Criticism affect Christian Teaching?

A Paper read before the West Norfolk Clerical Society, April 1903.

I have purposely thrown the thesis of this Paper into the form of a question, the answer to which, so far as I am able to formulate one, will, I hope, appear as we proceed. But, first, we must address ourselves to another question, which will perhaps occur to some readers, and that is, What is meant by the "Higher Criticism"? Is it a term arrogantly assumed by those who do not agree with the current teachings of tradition; and if not, what does it really imply?

The answer is very simple. The "Higher Criticism" is so named in contrast with that criticism which has to do only with the text of Scripture, and which may therefore be called "Lower."

The latter, *i.e.* the Lower Criticism, deals with the differences which are found between the readings of different MSS. and versions, and decides, as far as may be, which is the one which correctly represents the mind of the writer.

The "Higher Criticism," on the other hand, goes into the questions of date and authorship, and decides, chiefly from internal evidence, whether or not a document proceeds from the author to whom, and belongs to the date to which, it has been ascribed, and, further, whether books hitherto ascribed to one author are not in reality composite productions proceeding from many authors and belonging to many dates. For example, it is one of the results of the Higher Criticism that the books traditionally ascribed to Moses, with the Book of Joshua, which together form the "Hexateuch," did not assume their present form until after the Exile, in the fifth century B.C., and are a composite document containing the writings of authors known as J, E, D, and P, combined and unified by means of editorial notes and comments. It would take us too far afield to attempt to describe here the means by which these are distinguished. Full information may be obtained in Dr. Driver's *Genesis*, or in the same writer's *Introduction to the Old Testament*.

It must suffice to say here that the results are certain and indisputable. J and E, the earliest historians, belong to the ninth and eighth centuries B.C.; D, the Deuteronomist, to the seventh; and P, the Priestly Document, while embodying earlier practice, belongs, in the main, to the fifth century.

Secondly, my subject in this article is confined entirely to the Old Testament, the Higher Criticism of which, after being a burning question for the greater part of the nineteenth century, has now practically attained to certain sure and fixed results. There is

a Higher Criticism of the New Testament, but I do not propose to touch on that in this paper.

Thirdly, I would say that whatever views I may put forward, and however much they may run counter to cherished opinions—I will even say convictions—I would ask my readers to believe that I am speaking only as a loyal son of the Catholic Church, and subject to her ruling, and I would remind them that nowhere—through all her long history—has the Church formulated a hard and fast decision as to what she means by inspiration, nor as to the contents of revelation. No single doctrine of the Catholic faith is endangered by genuine, honest, reverent criticism, though it may receive a new setting more fitted to twentieth-century thought and knowledge than the stereotyped ideas of the older theology; rather does the realisation of the fact that the revelation of God to man was given through "earthen vessels"—men like ourselves, subject to all the errors and misconceptions of our common humanity—given, too, "as men were able to bear it"—enhance the bright shining of the light of God's truth, fed by the constant supply of the oil of God's Holy Spirit, with which those "earthen vessels," like the lamps of old Roman days, were filled.

My question, then, presupposes that certain results have been at length reached by the Higher Criticism.

I do not propose to go into the long history of the painful and painstaking processes through which those results have been attained. No doubt, in the process, many mistakes were made, and good men went further than the evidence warranted, but

as to the results there is a general consensus of opinion among scholars at the present time—notwithstanding that "much land yet remains to be occupied," and many obscure details still need light to be thrown upon them.

As to the results, I cannot do better than quote the words of Professor Collins in his Prefatory Essay to the 33rd volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*: "In no department of theology has there been so great a change as that which has come over the study of the Old Testament since about 1870. In a word, these years have seen the triumph of the Higher Criticism, *i.e.*, that criticism which deals not merely with textual and documentary dates, but which submits the documents themselves to analysis and reconstructs the history which they embody by the consideration of the spirit which underlies them, the whole atmosphere which they exhale, and all the knowledge that we can derive from external sources; in other words, that very historical criticism which has given us such large results in other fields of study. . . . Its main results are now accepted on all hands amongst scholars, for even the French Catholics, as M. Houtin" (I shall refer to him again presently) "has reminded us in his *Question Biblique chez les Catholiques de France* (1902), are now accepting them freely. It is agreed that the Prophets, not the Law, must be the starting-point of all our study of the history of Israel" (this was Wellhausen's great discovery), "and that the Hexateuch must be recognised as a compilation of late date, the chief constituent elements of which

have been distinguished and identified; that the early parts of Genesis, down to the call of Abraham, are great religious prose poems, based upon the folklore which the early Israelites had inherited in common with their neighbours, and that the story of the Patriarchal period has reached us as recorded by much later generations, though probably based on genuine historical tradition; that much of the contents of the Book of Judges is authentic; and that with the Books of Samuel we enter upon real and authentic history, which history is re-told from a later and biassed point of view in the Chronicles; lastly, that the whole Levitical system was a later growth, of which we can trace the stages with more or less of clearness. So far there is agreement; and results, assured as far as they go, have been reached."

Thus far Professor Collins, now Bishop of Gibraltar. To what he says, for he is tied to brevity, I may add what I consider, after long study, to be equally assured results, viz.:—

(1) That the Book of Job is a late production, almost certainly post-exilic, and that it is a magnificent drama, in which the problems of life are looked at from very much the same point of view as that from which they are regarded in *Hamlet*, though the finale is different. In fact, Job is the one example of a Hebrew tragedy, as the Song of Solomon is of a pastoral comedy.

(2) That the Book of Isaiah is a composite compilation of many dates, emanating from Isaiah and his school, and that the last twenty-seven chapters are post-exilic.

(3) That the Book of Psalms is a late compilation, and that, though it may, perhaps, contain one or two Psalms which may be ascribed to David—whose character of warrior-king as depicted in Samuel makes him totally unfitted to be the author of its most sublime poems—it is the Hymn-book of the second Temple. So I might go on, but enough has been said to awaken interest, and I doubt not, in some minds, strenuous opposition, because it is felt that all the solid ground won in childhood is being washed away by the incoming tide. These are the results upon which all scholars are agreed. Before passing on, however, I must devote a few words to the subject of the Book of Daniel. This is necessitated by the fact that not long ago the traditional view with regard to this book was put forward at Norwich by one who, I suppose, must be reckoned a scholar. The consensus of opinion is, notwithstanding, against him; and for myself, I agree with Dr. Driver in assigning it to a date not earlier than 350 B.C. Moreover, Dr. Pinches, in a book recently published by the S.P.C.K. itself (*The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*), frankly gives up any attempt to defend the authenticity of the events supposed to be recorded in this book, and the furthest to which he will go in the matter is to say: "Even though his (*i.e.* Daniel's) book be regarded as a romance, there is always the question whether the personages mentioned therein may not really have existed."

Such, then, being, in broad outline, the results of

the Higher Criticism as to the historical setting and authorship of the Old Testament Scriptures, we go on to ask, "How far do these results affect Christian teaching?"

Here we must distinguish. The educated, well-read layman will find them out for himself, or, at least, he has the opportunity of doing so, if he can spare time for the intellectual side of religion from his politics, and his business, and his pleasure. He will need guidance and help, need to be shown that the larger knowledge of the origin and growth of God's Word is no more opposed to the Holy Catholic Faith, and no more a cloak for infidelity or veiled Agnosticism, than are the results of science in the sphere of Astronomy and Biology. More of this anon. Alas! I fear the educated layman, if he does not get the cold shoulder, as a suspected heretic, from his clerical brother, is likely to get little help from the majority of the clergy on these subjects at present.

But there is the unlearned layman to be considered. The comfortable man of business, who, like Gallio, cares for none of these things; the labourer, who thinks but little, and forgets almost all he was ever taught. Are you to unsettle these people—to say nothing of the majority of women, whose minds are set for the most part on the sentimental side of religion, caring nothing for its intellectual side, knowing nothing of theology—by giving them new ideas which they will find it hard to assimilate, and, perhaps, in the process undermining their simple faith?

To deal with the latter class, perhaps the most difficult one, first.

It is quite possible—I say it boldly—for the clergy and other religious teachers to be true to their honest convictions and to let the results of their knowledge, provided only they know, permeate and leaven their teaching, both in the pulpit and out of it, in Bible class and school and private ministrations, without undermining the simple faith of the veriest babe in Christ, and to make the teaching of the Catholic Church come home to the thoughtless and the careless and the irreligious in a way it has never done before.

Too much of the teaching of the Old Testament has been made to hang upon a few great names. To Moses has been given the honour, not only of being the greatest lawgiver and general of antiquity, but almost one of its greatest historians and most voluminous writers. To David has been given the honour not only of being a mighty warrior-king, the welder of a number of petty tribes into a homogeneous nation, but also of being a great spiritual poet and teacher, the sweet Psalmist of Israel. So with Solomon, so with Isaiah, and others. Is it nothing, or is it something quite incomprehensible to simple minds, to show that far otherwise was God's method of revelation? Will not the simplest perceive its beauty when they realise that, coming as it did through countless minds and through unnumbered generations of unknown singers and teachers and writers, it is comparable rather to the slow and silent and im-

perceptible growth of the forest tree than to the succession of violent cataclysmic upheavals of an exploded theory of Geology? And here the doctrine of Evolution in the physical world steps in to illustrate the progress of God's revelation of Himself to man. "Precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little, and there a little," God revealed Himself, His will, His purposes.

Thus one is able to explain the apparent inconsistency that the God who is Love should have commanded the indiscriminate slaughter of the Canaanites or the Amalekites. In that age the loftiest minds in Israel had not, nor could they have, reached the conception of God vouchsafed to St. John, or even to Isaiah, and yet through, or in spite of, the misconceptions of the human instruments of revelation in the childhood of the race, God's purposes for mankind were being wrought out.

In the same way, to take another illustration: when it is realised that the story of Joshua commanding the sun and moon to stand still is, like many another misunderstood passage, merely a fragment of an early poem, couched in the high-flown imagery so dear to the Eastern mind, the foolish question will no longer be asked, "How can the facts of science be harmonised with this (supposed) fact of revelation?" Nor will clever men any longer waste their time in trying to do it! Here I may call to mind Matthew Arnold's dictum, which increasing knowledge only proves more and more true, "That more than half of the

so-called difficulties in the Bible arise from taking Eastern poetry and trying to make it fit in with the bald literalness of Western prose." Thus, if I may be allowed for a moment the apparent egoism of mentioning my own practice, I never preach from a Psalm or the Book of Job, or any other Old Testament passage, without first showing its historical setting, its meaning for the writer and those whom he addressed, before I go on to draw its lessons for ourselves.

Once more, to take an apparent contradiction in the Sacred Books themselves — how are we to reconcile 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 and 24 with 1 Chron. xxi. 1 and 25? The first is the historical narrative, taken from annals contemporary with the events; the second is the narrative of the same events coloured by the Chronicler's desire to exonerate God from the notion of temptation; he therefore substitutes "Satan" in harmony with the ideas of the later Jews, derived from the Babylonians during the Exile, which same ideas may be seen in Job, and he exaggerates the amount paid by David in accordance with his ideas of what ought to have been the magnificence and wealth of that monarch. The date of his account is about the fourth century B.C.

We now come to consider the case of the more learned or better educated among the laity. These men read the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and other works, and they ask how they are to reconcile the story of Creation, or the story of Paradise, or the

Fall of Man, or the Flood, and all that theology has built upon these things, with the teachings of science — of Geology, Biology, Evolution, and Anthropology? The answer of the Higher Criticism is complete. There needs no harmony, no reconciliation. All such attempts are doomed to failure,—are, therefore, mere waste of time, and, moreover, are needless. When it is understood that the "early parts of Genesis are great religious prose poems," all that is necessary has been said, for everything is wrapt up in that answer. But let me explain. Science, which is the inspiration of the Spirit of God acting on the mind of man through the facts of the physical Universe, so far as they can be ascertained, teaches the truth as to the early condition of the world and the processes by which man came to be. These "great religious prose poems" teach, in language fitted to the childhood of the race, man's rightful place in the Universe, and his spiritual relationship to the God who brought him into being, through all the marvellous progression of the ages. The Universe is the work of God; man, so far as we know, is the highest work of God, a being possessed of a higher than the mere animal nature, akin to God Himself. What we call the soul, the spiritual nature in man, was intended to overcome and subdue the lower nature derived from his animal ancestry. Original sin is the hereditary tendency in every child of man to allow the lower to master the higher, and the Fall of Man is repeated in the case of everyone who by yielding

to the temptations of the lower and the material, and allowing inclination to master duty, commits actual sin in thought, or word, or deed. Paradise tells of man's dream of a golden age in the past, only to be realised in the future. The Deluge is the reminiscence of some great catastrophe which overwhelmed a race of sinners, and proclaims the merited wrath of God against sin.

These stories were taken over by the Israelites from the Accadians and Sumerians, among whom they had been current for countless ages, and purified, and thus adapted to high moral ends. In this way it can be shown how the value of the Old Testament lies in its *moral* teaching, and in its progressive revelation of the character and purposes of God, until at length, through patriarch and prophet and seer, and through all the history of the chosen race, the way was prepared for the coming of the Perfect, the Ideal, Man, the Incarnation of the Son of God, whose life exhibits the life of the Spirit in perfect mastery over the flesh, whose death shows that only by the absolute sacrifice of the lower self can man attain the victory, and whose resurrection and ascension have procured gifts for men, the impartation of the Holy Spirit of God through the sacramental channels of grace, whereby man's weak will may be strengthened, and his hereditary tendency to evil subdued, and, through union with Him who overcame, he too may overcome.

This appears to me to be a much more open and honest, and, if I may say so, English method of

proceeding than the German plan, whereby all the discoveries and theories are confined to the professor and the classroom, and the "Predicants" are bidden to confine themselves wholly to the ancient orthodoxy in their ministrations.

It remains for the Church of England to point out a wiser way than either the method of the German Lutherans described above, or than the method of the Church of Rome, which, hampered by the decrees of the Tridentine and Vatican Councils, and by Papal letters and encyclicals, seeks to lower the standard, and to check even the desire of learning among the clergy, and has placed on the Index both M. Houtin's book, to which I referred above, and M. Loisy's book, *L'Évangile et l'Église*, which created so great a sensation when it was first published.

For this the Church of England is eminently fitted by her middle position between Rome and Geneva—subject neither to the autocracy of a (supposed) infallible Pope, nor bound to the blind worship of a (supposed) infallible book. This she will do, if her clergy and laity are earnest and vigilant and studious, if they do not allow her to throw away the golden opportunities which now exist for laying the foundations of an understanding between theology and modern ways of thinking by an obstinate adhesion to medieval positions, or a refusal to admit even the existence of difficulties. I hope that what M. Houtin says of the state of things in the Church of France may never be true of the Church of England: "At the end of the nineteenth century, perhaps, on an average, only two priests

in twenty could be found who interested themselves in Biblical questions. Of these one declared himself an uncompromising defender of tradition, the other one was open to the new ideas. Between these two battle would often be joined at clerical meetings or conferences. Discussion would promptly degenerate into bitterness or sharp words. The traditionalist would treat his adversary as a heretic, and the other, though his antagonist might be old, would end by answering him in terms but little flattering to his intelligence or his information. The others would remain dumb, embarrassed, anxious not to compromise themselves, judging the young man indeed exceedingly rash, but wishing all the same that he might be right, because they would no longer have to argue with M. Homais" (or, as we should say, Hodge) "about Adam and the apple or Jonah and the whale."

I said at the commencement of this paper that I intended to speak boldly and frankly, and if any timid Christians should be shocked or grieved I would ask them to forgive me and themselves seek for further light. We must remember that Galileo, who, when put in prison for maintaining that the earth was a sphere revolving round its own axis and round the sun, exclaimed, "E pur si muove," was right, as all the world now holds, and all the doctors of the Church were wrong. We must remember how the teachings of Geology were received, and how the doctrine of Evolution was decried as atheistical in the nineteenth century, though all the world now accepts them, and that in neither

the one case nor the other has any damage been done to the cause of true religion. Science and religion move on different planes, but each alike is the revelation of God, and it is the part of wisdom to discover the processes of the Divine working, so far as may be, and "to justify the ways of God to man."

As regards the Bible itself, the earthen vessel which contains the heavenly treasure whereby man may know God and be made like Him, no words can better express my own sense of its inestimable and permanent value than those used by Mr. Balfour at the Centenary Meeting of the Bible Society on March 6th, 1903: "In my view, for whatever that view may be worth, the increasing knowledge which we have of the history, not only of Israel, but of all the nations which influenced, or were influenced by, the Jewish people, our better knowledge of the texts . . . —these things, so far from rendering the Bible less valuable to us, or less interesting to us, from a religious point of view, greatly augment the value which it must have for an educated community. These researches make it far more of a living record of the revelation of God to mankind than it ever was or ever could be to those who, from the nature of the case, had no adequate conception of the circumstances in which that revelation occurred, or the people to whom it was vouchsafed. And I most truly think that not only is the Bible now what it has always been to the unlearned, a source of consolation, of hope, and of encouragement, but it is to those who are more

learned, but not probably nearer the kingdom of heaven, augmented in interest, and not diminished, and a more valuable source of spiritual life now than it could ever have been in pre-critical days." Or, to quote Professor George Adam Smith: "It is, then, a Revelation; this is the supreme thing for you as preachers. In this is summed up all your opportunity and all your confidence in the Old Testament."

Or, Professor Kirkpatrick: "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy; and in the light of historic experience it bids us rest assured that the work of Redemption which we see carried to a point of completion, which is in itself a new and unique beginning, will not fail or be frustrated, but will finally reach that supreme conclusion, when God shall be *all in all*."[1]

II.

The Higher Criticism and the Miraculous.

Let us consider how the matter stands when the whole field of "the miraculous or non-miraculous point of view" is introduced. First of all, what is meant by a miracle? If a miracle is the arbitrary intervention in the affairs of the Universe of a Deity who stands outside it, and causes some act to be performed contrary to its laws merely in the way of portent or prodigy, then no one to-day outside the

[1] Smith, *The Preaching of the Old Testament to the Age*, p. 59; Kirkpatrick, *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, p. 527.

ranks of the uneducated and the ignorant believes in such a Deity, or in such actions on His part. But if a miracle is the calling into action of some higher law, previously unknown to experience, on the part of a Deity who is immanent in, and the informing intelligence of, the Universe He has made, then no educated person will to-day deny the possibility of such action on the part of such a Deity for a worthy object.

It was of the former eighteenth-century Deistic conception of a miracle that Matthew Arnold wrote, "Miracles do not happen."

It was of the latter philosophico-scientific conception that Professor Huxley wrote, "Miracles are not *a priori* impossible."

The former was the only conception possible in a pre-scientific age.

The latter is the only conception possible to us now; but it is possible; and to deny it would be to assume, as Bishop Butler puts it, that human experience covers the whole range of created things, and that there is no "vasty deep" unexplored beyond.

There is another point, however, to be borne in mind. To children, as to savages, miracles are of everyday occurrence, or rather they are not miracles at all. The thunder is the voice of God, the lightning is His arrow, whether that God be Jove or Jehovah; birds and beasts converse; and even inanimate things, such as trees and stones, have a power of utterance.

Hence we are not surprised that in a literature

which embodies much of the ideas consonant with the childhood of the race, we should read of a "talking donkey" or a serpent able to converse, but we know exactly what value to attach to these interesting relics of antiquity, just as we do to the fables of Pilpai or Æsop.

Again, when we read of the walls of Jericho falling at the blast of the trumpet, or of the sun and moon standing still, or of the adventures of Jonah in the sea monster's belly, we know that we are reading poetic embellishments of legendary stories, exactly of the same kind as that which occurs in the 74th Psalm, which is admitted poetry, where we are told in connection with the dividing of the Red Sea and the maintenance of the Israelites during their desert journey: "Thou didst divide the sea through Thy power; Thou brakest the heads of the dragons in the waters. Thou smotest the heads of leviathan in pieces, and gavest him to be meat for the people in the wilderness." The sacred writer is here referring to the mythical dragon, Tiâmat, and to his being a many-headed monster like Cerberus, but who will say that even he himself intended his statement to be taken literally?

These are all bits of primitive folklore common to the Israelites with all races of mankind in their childhood, and perfectly *natural* and easy of belief to people who look out upon the world with the eyes of children, and, in fact, as Dr. Tylor has shown, they are the embodiment of the "science" of the primitive races. Thus I deny *in toto* that the principle of the miraculous, rightly defined, stands

or falls with the literal truth of the story of Balaam's ass, or the falling of Jericho's walls. In the childhood of the race the commonplaces of our everyday existence, our railways and motor cars, our telegraphs and telephones, the wonders of electricity and of radium, the marvels accomplished by the Röntgen rays, would all have been "miracles." To take an example. Ariosto, in the sixteenth century, invokes præterhuman aid to transport a British army in one day from Picardy to Paris, a journey which is now accomplished in a few hours.

When we come to the New Testament and the question of the Incarnation and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, we are on different ground altogether, and the man who reproaches us with believing in these great truths, although we may not believe in the literal truth of the story of Balaam's ass, is confounding the two conceptions of the miraculous of which I spoke above, and assuming that his experience covers the whole range of possibilities, exactly in the same way as Ariosto would have done had he absolutely denied the possibility of ever journeying from Picardy to Paris in a few hours without supernatural aid, because it was contrary to his and all men's experience up to his time.

Putting on one side all the documents of the New Testament, except the earliest Gospel, *i.e.*, the original Gospel of St. Mark (the Ur-Marcus of the Germans), and the universally admitted authentic Epistles of St. Paul, viz., 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians, we find in them a picture of the Christ as He impressed His two greatest

followers, St. Peter and St. Paul, which can only be explained on the assumption that He was, in a special sense, as St. Mark says, "Son of God" as well as "Son of Man"; and, the redemption of the human race being a worthy object, the probability that the birth of the Redeemer should be accomplished in an unusual way becomes enhanced, and enters the region of the possible; the "Incarnation" thus becomes no more marvellous or unbelievable, as the action of the immanent Deity, in the Person of the Eternal Word, the Second Person in the Trinity, bringing Himself into a close personal relationship with the one intelligent race of creatures produced in the course of evolution, than the fact that Professor Loeb has been able recently to fertilise the eggs of the sea-urchin by the action of certain salts instead of in the usual process of Nature, or the fact of parthenogenesis among insects, are unbelievable, however wonderful. In these instances we have the calling into action of higher laws than are known to ordinary experience by Nature herself, by man, and by God, and these three are, mystically, One.

Christ being what He was, in His own consciousness, with which His life and charactor agree, Son of God, apart altogether from the miracles attributed to Him, the Incarnation becomes the only truly scientific method of explaining His being.

As regards the miracles attributed to Christ and the apostles, we must remember that the early Christians were still as much in the pre-scientific age as were the Israelites of Joshua's days, or the heathen from among whom they were called, or Ariosto in

the sixteenth century. Early Christianity shares with all world-religions a boundless belief in the miraculous. The whole earth is thereby transformed into an enchanted world. The world of Nature is a world of wonders, and though faith in the miraculous surpasses all bounds, yet it is not consciously dealing with exceptional cases, but with everyday phenomena which are perfectly natural. Apart from the miracles of healing, which are of the same kind, though on a higher plane, with modern faith-healing, this is no doubt the explanation of the miracles with which early Christian literature abounds, and even perhaps of such miracles of Christ as the walking on the sea or the turning the water into wine; although, for my own part, believing Him to be the Incarnate Son of God, I have no difficulty in accepting these, and similar "wonders" ascribed to Him, as facts.

So also the actions of the human mind and the domain of the Spirit were mysteries to the early Christians as to all pre-scientific Anthropology, and thus the phenomena of lunacy were ascribed to the being possessed by demons, and the ecstatic state which manifested itself, for instance, by the speaking with tongues was ascribed to the direct impulse of the Holy Spirit of God.

As regards the Resurrection, the appearances of the Risen Lord to His followers are stated as an undoubted fact by St. Paul in the cardinal passage, 1 Cor. xv. 4–8; but we must remember that the apostle employs the same Greek word, meaning "he was seen," to describe the appearance to himself on the way to Damascus, and those to Cephas and

James and to the "five hundred brethren at once." This evidently implies that he conceived of all as being of the same nature, *i.e.*, a heavenly vision visible to those who had eyes to see, and beyond this we do not need to go.

The question of the empty tomb and the risen body are of entirely secondary importance, and depend on the laws of ordinary human evidence and the authenticity of documents, and must be judged accordingly.

It was St. Paul's belief that he had seen the Risen Lord, and been commissioned by Him, that transformed the world; and, like the apostle, the Christian who will win the world for Christ is the man who "knows Him and the power of His resurrection."

The non-miraculous point of view, in the first sense of the word "miracle," is established by an enlarged study of Nature and by scientific Anthropology; but a non-miraculous Christ in the second sense of the word "miracle" is inconceivable. My belief in Him, and in the credibility of the "mighty works which showed forth themselves in Him," is not founded on any *a priori* assumptions, but on reasoning that is both *a posteriori* and *a fortiori*.—*The Norfolk Review*, Sept. 1905.

III

Frames of Mind

I will subjoin here a letter which I wrote in the course of a correspondence in the *Eastern Daily*

Press, as it puts my views on the points discussed in a nutshell, and will therefore be of interest beyond the circle originally addressed :—

"Really the obtuseness in one direction of some of the 'non-clerical' participants in this discussion, of which your correspondent 'X.' in to-day's *Eastern Daily Press* is an example, is quite a match for any obtuseness or dogmatic bigotry in the other direction which may be displayed by some clerics.

"Has 'X.' never heard of the 'historic perspective,' by means of which those clerics who are not tied to antiquated formulæ are enabled with perfect honesty to adjust their point of view, and, in Holy Writ, to separate the kernel from the husk?

"To take 'X.'s' two illustrations from the Ten Commandments and the belief in witchcraft. I will tell him what my 'frame of mind' is :—

"(1) I repeat the Fourth Commandment with the full persuasion that the provision of one day's rest in seven—whether the seventh day, as enjoined in this Code, or the first, as enjoined by the Christian Church in memory of the Resurrection —was a wise and humane proceeding on the part of the Hebrew legislator. It did not originate with him, as a similar provision is found in the Code of Hammurabi, king of Babylon, 1000 years before.

"The original 'Ten Words' were in all probability each framed in the same way as the Sixth to the Ninth commandments appear—*i.e.*, the injunction, with no commentary attached. Thus the Fourth

Commandment would simply run: 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' The commentary in this case is the work of one who was acquainted with the priestly narrative of the Creation in Gen. i.–ii. 4, and he accordingly emphasises the command by assigning the reason he does for it. A previous writer, viz., the Deuteronomist in the seventh century B.C., assigns a very different and more human reason for the injunction, viz., that the Israelite might be reminded of his redemption from Egypt (Deut. v. 15), and this idea is carried on in the Christian commemoration of the world's redemption on the Lord's Day.

"I think myself the Church would do wisely to substitute this form of the Commandment for the one now in use, but until that is done I continue to obey her ruling, remembering the value of the injunction, and that, though the reason given may not appeal to me in the twentieth century of the Christian era, it was true, and therefore forceful to the writer in the age in which he lived. I am not hereby contravening the spirit of the 6th Article of the Church of England, which merely affirms that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation'; but not what it contains besides, nor the method and mode of its contents.

"(2) Here again the historic perspective and the study of Anthropology make the fact that such a command as this, 'Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live,' is included in the Israelitish Code of intense interest to the student of God's Word. It testifies to the fact that down to the seventh century B.C., and

probably much later, the Israelites were no more advanced than the rest of the nations of antiquity in their outlook upon the world, as, indeed, could hardly be expected.

"The belief in witches and witchcraft is a survival from the earliest beliefs of mankind, as may be seen in the case of modern savages, who have never emerged from it. The life of the West African native, or of the natives of Australia, to take only two examples, is hemmed round and encompassed with an all-embracing atmosphere of witchcraft, as Miss Mary Kingsley and Messrs. Spencer and Gillen have shown. All their religion and magic is based upon it; and this is the case universally: it is part and parcel of savage life.

"This belief died out gradually as civilisation advanced. We hear little of it in Europe from the eighth to the thirteenth centuries. There was then a tremendous recrudescence of the belief, and a revival of it down to the seventeenth century, during which period unheard-of atrocities were perpetrated against its victims, chiefly harmless old women, until at length advancing culture gave it the *coup de grace*. (See Professor Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, vol. i. pp. 137–141.)

"In some out-of-the-way corners, and even in our own county, it still lingers on as an interesting survival from prehistoric times. As an illustration of this, I may mention that not so long ago a girl was seriously believed to have been bewitched in my own parish; and in 1902 one of my parishioners, an educated man, expressed no surprise at the King's

illness and the postponement of the Coronation, because an 'old witch' in a neighbouring parish was supposed to have predicted it! And why are horse-shoes hung by the stable door, but to keep the witches and elves at bay?

"Meanwhile I read the command in the Hebrew Code as an instance of the universal survival of the belief in that age, but one which I am not any longer required to pay attention to, except so far as it bears upon anthropological studies."

IV.

Reasons for signing the "Declaration on Biblical Criticism."

The following letter was sent by me to the *Standard* in May 1905, and was written to explain my reasons for signing the "Declaration on Biblical Criticism" then recently put forth by one hundred Anglican clergymen. Of it M. Houtin says (*La Question Biblique au 20ème Siècle*), "The letter is perfectly orthodox," and it is included here because its standpoint is that of this book.

"I signed it because, practically, it merely claims for the Higher Criticism of the New Testament the same 'fair field and no favour' which the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament has at length won for itself—in the opinion of all who are really competent to judge. In other words,

it claims that it is now time for Christian people to recognise that nothing which is really a fact in the sphere of Nature can be opposed to what is really a fact in the sphere of revelation, and to all who believe that the God of Nature and the God of Revelation are one, this is a self-evident proposition.

"Archdeacon Sinclair says that the Declaration is unnecessary. I think, on the contrary, that the Church of to-day needs to be reminded of the fate of Galileo's judges, who condemned him, on the authority of their inherited misconceptions of revelation, for teaching that the earth and the planets revolve round the sun, and who are now only remembered as monuments of folly, while every school child is instructed in the truths which they condemned. This is what the Declaration does.

"As regards the Old Testament, who now needs to be told that the first chapter of Genesis contains no revelation of the facts of Creation beyond the sublime truth that God is the Creator; while the words, the method, the time occupied, are simply the picture of the Creation as it presented itself to the priestly philosopher learned in Babylonian lore? Hence the time has come when the clergy should no longer be required to repeat the misleading priestly comment on the Fourth Commandment in the office of the Holy Communion. It should either be dropped altogether, or the Deuteronomic comment substituted for it (Deut. v. 15). Who now needs to be told that the stories of the creation of woman, of the speaking serpent, of Balaam's ass,

of the sun and moon standing still, and such like, are bits of primitive folklore and poetry, embedded in the traditions and legends of the Hebrew people? They all contain highly useful moral teaching, and, as such, have been preserved; but they are none of them facts, though the Church in former ages may have taken them in that sense. Christian people have had to modify their beliefs in the light of the fact that life on the earth is millions of years old, of which they have been reminded only recently by the presentation of the Diplodocus Carnegii to the British Museum, and that the existence of man on the earth goes back for hundreds of centuries, of which the proof is found not only in the fact that the history of Egypt begins before the year 4000 B.C., behind which stretches a long prehistoric period, which is now well known, but also in the undoubted presence of man in Europe in the far-away times when Britain was still a part of the Continent, and in the inter-glacial periods at the commencement of the Quaternary Epoch.

"As regards the New Testament, the same thing holds good, to a modified degree. For example, we can still say, 'I believe in the resurrection of the body,' or even 'of the flesh,' but we no longer believe in the resuscitation of the material particles, as our forefathers did.

"The question, then, is this: Are we to say that the same patient and reverent study which has thrown fresh light on the Old Testament, and made it a new and living Book, is not to be devoted to the New Testament, or are we to shirk this study

because we are afraid of the results? Is the Church not the living Body of Christ, or has the Holy Spirit ceased to inspire her?

"The results may confirm or they may modify preconceived and inherited beliefs and interpretations; but, so far as they are results and not theories, they must be accepted. Only let us be certain of our facts, and, till then, let us possess our souls in patience.

"For these reasons I have signed the Declaration, which claims the right of free, full, and reverent inquiry, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, into the credentials and teaching of the documents in which the faith of the Church is enshrined, but not defined, and the right to modify belief in accordance with new knowledge."

See in the *Hibbert Journal*, January 1907, the article by the Rev. Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt., entitled "A Grave Peril to the Liberty of Churchmen: The Ecclesiastical Discipline Report," particularly pp. 254–56, where the writer discusses the position of those Churchmen who, like himself and the author of these Lectures, may be classed among the "more thoroughgoing 'higher critics,' and less compromising thinkers, if their opinions came to be adjudicated upon by a body of men (the Bishops), among whom the Bishop of Birmingham represents at least the left centre." With regard to the Report, the writer concludes, and in this I agree with him, that "it would be far better that the incense-burning, and the reservation and the

other Romanising (?) practices should go on a little longer in a few dozen or a few hundred churches than that a weapon should be placed in the hands of persecuting and obscurantist prelates for driving out of the ministry of the Church the clergy who take the trouble to study, who have the clearness of mind to accept, and the courage to proclaim to-day results of science, of criticism, and of thought which may be universally accepted to-morrow."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LECTURE I.

DEWAR. Presidential Address, British Association, Belfast, 1902.
DRIVER. Genesis (The Westminster Commentaries, 1904).
HARNACK. What is Christianity? 1901.
ILLINGWORTH. Divine Immanence, 1906.
,, Personality, Human and Divine, 1905.
LODGE. Life and Matter, 1906.
,, Articles in the *Hibbert Journal*, 1906.
ORR. God's Image in Man, 1906.
REYNOLDS. The Supernatural in Nature, 1880.
WEINEL. St. Paul, the Man and his Work, 1906.

LECTURE II.

BALDWIN. Development and Evolution, 1902.
BASTIAN. Nature and Origin of Living Matter, 1906.
,, The Evolution of Life, 1907.
BATESON. Mendel's Principles of Heredity, 1902.
CHATTERTON-HILL. Heredity and Selection in Sociology, 1907.
COPE. Primary Factors in Evolution.
DARWIN. Origin of Species, 1859.
,, Descent of Man, 1871.
,, Animals and Plants under Domestication, 1868, etc.
EIMER. Organic Evolution.
GEIKIE. Geology.
HAECKEL. The Riddle of the Universe, 1906.
,, The Evolution of Man, 1907.
,, Last Words on Evolution, 1906.

HEADLEY. Problems of Evolution, 1900.
,, Life and Evolution, 1906.
HUXLEY. Collected Essays, 1898.
LANKESTER. The Kingdom of Man, 1907.
LODGE. Life and Matter, 1906.
,, The Substance of Faith, 1907.
NÄGELI. Mechanisch-Physiologische Theorie der Abstemmungslehre, 1884.
SALEEBY. Evolution the Master Key, 1906.
SOLLAS. The Age of the Earth, 1905.
WAGGETT. The Scientific Temper in Religion, 1905.
WEISMANN. The Evolution Theory, 1903.
WILSON. Problems of Science and Religion, 1903.
,, Sermon before the British Association, 1907.

LECTURE III.

ABERCROMBY. Pre- and Proto- Historic Finns, 1898.
ASTLEY. Ornaments of Jet and Cannel Coal and Slate Implements in Neolithic Times.
,, Portuguese Parallels to the Clydeside Discoveries (*Journal* of the British Archæological Association, 1900, 1904).
AVEBURY. Prehistoric Times.
BOYD-DAWKINS. Cave-Hunting.
,, Early Man in Britain.
CAPART. Primitive Art in Egypt, 1905.
CLODD. The Story of Primitive Man, 1895.
EVANS. Ancient Stone Implements of Great Britain, 1897.
,, Ancient Bronze Implements of Great Britain, 1881.
HOERNES. Der Diluviale Mensch in Europa, 1903.
,, Die Urgeschichte der bildenden Kunst in Europa, 1898.
,, Primitive Man (Temple Cyclopædic Primers, 1s.).
JOLY. Man before Metals.
LAING. Modern Science and Modern Thought, 1890.
,, Human Origins, 1892.
LAMPLEIGH. Presidential Address to the Geological Section of the British Association, York, 1906, on Glacial Periods in England.
MUNRO. Prehistoric Problems.
,, The Lake-Dwellings of Europe, 1890.
REINACH. The Story of Art throughout the Ages, 1904.

SCHLIEMANN. Mycenæ, Troja, Tiryns, Ilios } Containing the accounts of his explorations on these sites, 1878–1886.
WAKEMAN. Handbook of Irish Antiquities, 1903.
WINDLE. Life in Early Britain, 1897.
WOOD-MARTIN. Pagan Ireland, 1895.

LECTURE IV.

ASTLEY, as in previous Lecture, and, in addition:
,, Neolithic Man: his Ideas and their Evidences (*Antiquary*, 1900).
,, Religious and Magical Ideas of Modern Savage Peoples (*Journal* of the British Archæological Association, 1901).
,, Tree and Pillar Worship. (*Transactions* of the Royal Society of Literature, 1903).
CARTER. The Religion of Numa, 1906.
CRAWLEY. The Mystic Rose, 1902.
,, The Tree of Life, 1905.
CROOKE. The Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India, 1896.
DENNETT. At the Back of the Black Man's Mind, 1906.
Encyclopædia Britannica (10th edition). Articles on Anthropology, Magic, Religion, etc.
EVANS. Mycenæan Tree and Pillar Cult, 1901.
FARNELL. The Evolution of Religion, 1905.
FRAZER. The Golden Bough, 1897.
,, Adonis, Attis, Osiris, being the Golden Bough, 3rd ed. part iv., 1907.
,, Totemism, 1907.
HADDON. Presidential Address to Anthropological Section of the British Association, Belfast, 1902, on Totemism.
HARTLAND. Presidential Address to Anthropological Section of the British Association, York, 1906, on Religion and Magic of Primitive Man.
HOWITT. The Native Tribes of South-East Australia, 1904.
JEVONS. Religion in Evolution, 1906.
JOHNSON AND WRIGHT. Neolithic Man in North-East Surrey, 1904.
KINGSLEY. Travels in West Africa, 1897.
,, West African Studies, 1901.

LANG. Magic and Religion, 1901.
,, Myth, Ritual, and Religion, 1899.
,, Religion and Custom, 1897.
,, The Secret of the Totem, 1905.
LANGLOH-PARKER. The Euahlayi Tribe, 1905.
L'Anthropologie. Journal of the French Anthropological Society, *passim*.
LENNARD. The Lower Niger and its Tribes, 1906.
MACDONALD. Religion and Myth, 1893.
MACLENNAN. Studies in Ancient History, vol. i. 1886, vol. ii. 1896.
REINACH. The Story of Art throughout the Ages, 1904.
SPENCER AND GILLEN. The Native Tribes of Central Australia, 1899.
,, The Northern Tribes of Central Australia, 1904.
TYLOR. Primitive Culture, 1891.
WOOD-MARTIN. Traces of the Elder Faiths of Ireland, 1902.
Publications of the Royal Anthropological Institute, *passim*.
Series of "Ancient Religions." (Constable, 1s. each.)
Series of "Native Races of the British Empire." (Constable, 6s. each.)

LECTURE V.

ADDIS. The Documents of the Hexateuch, vol. i. 1892, vol. ii. 1898.
ASTLEY. The Date of the Samaritan Pentateuch (*Thinker*, 1892).
CHEYNE. The Hallowing of Criticism, 1888.
,, The Origin of the Psalter, 1891.
,, Commentary on Isaiah, 1880.
,, Jeremiah (Men of the Bible Series), 1887.
,, Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel, 1907.
,, Reform in the Teaching of the Old Testament (Essays for the Times).
,, Articles in *Encyclopædia Biblica*.
CORNILL. Rise of the People of Israel.
,, Prophets of Israel.
,, Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, 1907.
DILLMANN. Commentary on Genesis.
DRIVER. Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, 1892.
,, Genesis (Westminster Commentaries, 1904).
,, Deuteronomy (Int. Nat. Crit. Com., 1895).
,, Isaiah (Men of the Bible Series).

DRIVER AND KIRKPATRICK. The Higher Criticism, 1905.
EWALD. History of Israel, 1883.
FOAKES-JACKSON. The Biblical History of the Hebrews, 1904.
FRAZER. Folk-lore in the Old Testament, in Anthropological Essays, presented to E. B. Tylor on his Seventy-fifth Birthday, 1907.
GIBSON. Messages of the Old Testament, 1906.
HOBHOUSE. Sermon, *Guardian*, 25, ix. 1907.
HOGARTH. Authority and Archæology, 1899.
HOUTIN. La Question Biblique au 20ème Siècle, 1906.
JACOBS. Biblical Archæology, 1894.
KIRKPATRICK. The Divine Library of the Old Testament, 1891.
,, The Doctrine of the Prophets, 1892.
KITTEL. A History of the Hebrews, 1895.
KUENEN. The Religion of Israel, 1874.
,, National Religions and Universal Religions. (Hibbert Lectures, 1882).
LAGRANGE. Historical Criticism and the Old Testament, 1906.
OTTLEY. The Religion of Israel, 1905.
PETRIE. Researches in Sinai, 1906.
PFLEIDERER. Primitive Christianity, 1906.
RYLE. Early Narratives of Genesis, 1899.
,, The Canon of the Old Testament, 1892.
ROBERTSON SMITH. The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 1892.
,, The Religion of the Semites, 1907.
SMYTHE-PALMER. Babylonian Influence on the Bible, 1897.
,, Jacob at Bethel, 1899.
TYRRELL. Through Scylla and Charybdis, 1907.
WELLHAUSEN. History of Israel, 1885.
WERNLE. The Beginnings of Christianity, 1903.

LECTURE VI.

As in preceding Lecture, with the following additions:—
ASTLEY. The Holy Eucharist (*The Anglo-Catholic*, 1899).
CHATTERTON-HILL. Heredity and Selection in Sociology, 1907.
Contentio Veritatis, by Six Oxford Tutors, 1902. Inge: The Sacraments.
Encyclopædia Biblica, articles on Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Divination, Historical Literature, Idolatry, Magic, Nature-Worship, etc.
Encyclopædia Britannica (10th edition), articles *ad rem*.

GARDNER. The Growth of Christianity, 1907.
HARNACK. The History of Dogma, 1894–1899.
HASTINGS' Dictionary of the Bible, articles, Cosmology, etc.
Hibbert Journal, Jan. 1908. Father Tyrrell on The Prospects of Modernism.
HOBHOUSE. Morals in Evolution, 1906.
LOISY. L'Évangile et l'Église, 1904.
Lux Mundi, edited by Bishop Gore (10th edition), 1890. Illingworth: The Incarnation and Development. Gore: The Holy Spirit and Inspiration.
SWETE. "Modernism" and the Church (*Guardian*, 29, i. 1908).
TENNANT. The Origin and Propagation of Sin, 1906.

Consult also the articles in the *Hibbert Journal* referred to in this work.

The works mentioned in the foregoing Bibliography have all been consulted, together with many others bearing on the subjects of the Lectures, by the author. Their inclusion does not imply agreement on the part of the author with all, or any, of the views of the writers, except so far as may be gathered from his own statements in the body of the book. These works are selected because they are likely to be specially useful to the student who wishes to carry further the investigation of the subjects dealt with herein. The works mentioned in the Bibliographies appended to many of them may also be usefully consulted.

H. J. D. A.

INDEX

Aaron, 212, 218.
Abraham, 160, 196, 197.
Adam, Bishop South on, 27.
  as first man, 93, 94, 222.
Adonis, *Attis*, *Osiris*, 170, 269.
Africa, natives of, 150.
  West, 148, 150, 151, 157.
Agriculture in Neolithic Age, 111, 112.
"Alcheringa," the, 30, 144, 146, 151.
Allen, Grant, 140, 152.
Amos, 185, 189.
Ancestor worship, 153.
Animism, at root of St. Paul's theology, 255–257.
  defined, 141, 142.
  in primitive Christianity, 257, 258.
  in Old Testament, 289–291.
  survivals of, in Israel, 158–164, 194, 226.
Anthropology, 16, 30, 231, 236.
  literature of, 138.
Archæology, prehistoric, 16, 30, 231, 236.
Architecture, evolution of, 46, 47, 109.
Arnold, Matt., 182, 281, 289.
Asherah, 161, 204.
Astronomy, 17–20, 43, 91.
Astruc, Jean, 179.
Australian natives, social condition of, 143–148.
Avebury, Lord, 95, 98.

Babel, Tower of, 195.
Babylonia, 99, 107, 116, 119, 120, 194.
  influence of, on Israel, 30, 39, 123, 159, 191, 221, 228, 229, 282, 284, 295, 299.
Balaam, 29, 162, 290, 291.
Balfour, Mr., on Bible, 287.
Ball, Sir Robert, 74.
Baptism, holy, 251, 252.
Bastian, Dr., 53, 54, 60, 62, 64, 65.
Beginnings of Christianity, 257, 258.
Bernard, Prof., 259.
Bible, inspiration of, 175.
  Higher Criticism of, 176, *sqq.*, 274, *sqq.*
Biology, 44, 68, 92.
Bond, F., *Gothic Architecture in England*, 47.
Bronze Age, 115–120.
Buckland, Bridgewater Treatise, 24.
Butler, Bishop, 287.

Campbell, Rev. R. J., 129, 240, 259–262.

Capart, M., 113.
Carlyle, *Past and Present*, 254, 255.
Chalmers, Dr., 25.
Chatterton-Hill, 62, 265.
Chemosh, 201, 208.
Cheyne, Prof., 183.
Christ, an ideal, 7–9.
Christ, incarnation of, 292.
  miracles of, 293.
  resurrection of, 293, 294.
  the goal of prophecy, 125, 215, 227, 241, 247, 250–255, 291–294.
Christianity independent of theology, 28, 31, 32.
Church of England, position of, 175, 178, 285, 286.
Church Quarterly Review, 260–262.
Churinga, 145.
Colenso, Bishop, 180, 182.
Collins, Bishop, 276, 277.
Confirmation, 252.
Contentio Veritatis, 268.
Cope, 44, 59.
Copernicus, 17.
Crawley, E., 138, 167, 238, 239.
Criticism, Higher and Lower, defined, 176, 177, 273–274.
Criticism, Higher, or historical, no new thing, 177–178.
  bridge between Science and Theology, 175.
  of Old Testament, history of, 179–184.
  of Homer, Browning on, 209–211.
  results of, 276–278.

Dante, 94.
Darwin, Charles, 17, 44, 54, 57, 62, 78.
Darwin, Prof. G. H., 62, 63.
Dawson, Sir J. W., 24.
Death, primitive ideas of, 153, 154.
"Declaration on Biblical Criticism, The," 298.
Deuteronomy, 186, 220.
Dewar, Prof., 40.
De Wette, 180.
Die Anfänge unserer Religion, 225.
Diluviale Mensch in Europa, Der, 126–128.
"Directivity," 39, 87.
Dolmens, 110, 198.
Dorian invasion, the, 115, 117.
Driver, Dr., 38, 183, 259, 278.
  Genesis, 21–23, 34–36, 259, 274.

E, characteristics of, 191, 196.
Egypt, 99, 105, 107, 109, 113, 115, 116, 119, 183, 185, 189, 190, 194, 199.
  Neolithic burial in, 110.
Eichhorn, 180.
Eimer, 44.
Eli, 202.
Elijah, 203, 204.
Elohim, 160, 229.
Emerson, 133.
Encyclopædia Biblica, 198.
  Britannica, 276.
Ertnatulunga, 145.
Euahlayi Tribe, The, 143, 157.
Eucharist, the Holy, 155.
Evolution, Lamarck's theory of, 44, 45.
Evolution the Master-key, 50, 140.
Evolution Theory, 62, 71.
Ewald, 180.

Fetishism, 142, 205, 252, 253, 264.
Flints, worked, found in Western Europe, 95, 96.
  found in River-drift and Caves, 97.
  significance of, 95–99.
  specimen found in Gray's Inn, 94, 96.
Folklore, survival of primitive ideas in, 150, 152.
  in Israel, 158, 163, 194, 290;

Folklore, in Europe, 158, 163, 194.
Frazer, Dr. J. G., 138, 170, 269.
Future life, belief in, in Neolithic Age, 110, 111.

Galileo, 17, 20, 286.
Galton, Sir Francis, 59, 60.
Gardner, 34, 262, 263.
Genesis, early narratives of, 28–30, 124.
Genesis i., origin and meaning of, 38–40, 160, 228–230, 296.
Genesis ii. and iii., 108, 120, 134, 159, 191, 194, 195, 290.
Geology, 20–23, 43, 91.
Glacial Periods in Europe, 101–107, 126–128.
God, idea of, progressively developed, 9–11, 121–124.
immanent yet transcendent, 11, 65, 77, 83, 87, 129–130, 247.
God's Image in Man, 27.
Gore, Bishop, 239, 241.
Graf, 180.
Growth of Christianity, The, 33, 34, 262, 263.
Guardian, the, 38–40.

Haddon, Mr. A. C., 233, 264.
Haeckel, 44, 48, 49, 66, 69, 77, 99, 249.
Hammurabi, Code of, 230, 295.
Harnack, *History of Dogma*, 5.
What is Christianity? 32.
Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, 259.
Headley, *Life and Evolution*, 83–85.
Problems of Evolution, 266.
Henslow, Prof., 39, 58, 87.
Heredity belongs to the germ-plasm, 60.
Heredity and Selection in Sociology, 62, 265, 266.
Heredity, Weismann on, 45, 60, 62, 237, 245.
Herschel, 17.
Hexateuch, documents of, 185–187.
Hexateuch, final redaction of, 221.
Hezekiah, Reformation of, 185, 219.
Hibbert Journal, 6, 36, 87, 130, 184, 211, 301, 308.
Historical Criticism of the Old Testament, 184.
History of Dogma, 5.
Hoernes, Dr., 126, 128.
Hosea, 185, 189.
Houtin, M., 184, 285, 298.
Howitt, 138, 147.
Human race, cradle of, 99.
Huxley, 44, 289.

Inge, Dr. W. R., 268.
Initiation ceremonies, 236.
Irving, Rev. Dr., 38.
Isaac, 160, 196, 197.
Israel, animistic ideas in, 158–164, 226.
earliest writers of, 185.
early religious ideas of, 193-208.
exilic and post-exilic religion of, 221–227.
folklore in, 158, 163, 194, 290.
origin of, 120.
prophets in, 216 *sqq*.

J, characteristics of, 190, 196.
animism in, 194.
Jacob, 160, 196, 197, 198.
Jacobs, *Biblical Archæology*, 163.
JE, 186, 190, 191, 193–201, 218.
original sources in, 191, 192.
Jephthah, 201.
Jerahmeel, 183, 211.
Jesus of Nazareth, 7.
Jezebel, 203, 207.
Joly, 64.
Joshua, 161.
Josiah, Reformation of, 185, 220.
Judges, 201, 202.

Kelvin, Lord, 51, 52, 64.
Kepler, 17.
Kingdom of Man, The, 73, 93.
Kingsley, Miss Mary, 138, 150, 297.
Kirkpatrick, Dr., 288.
Kuenen, 180, 192.
Kurtz, 25.

Lagrange, M., 184.
Lake-dwellings, 112, 139.
Lamarck, 44, 45.
Lang, A., 138, 143.
Langloh-Parker, Mrs., 143, 146.
Lankester, Dr. Ray, 52, 53, 73, 93.
Laplace, 17.
Last Words on Evolution, 66.
"Laying on of Hands," 251.
Leonard, Major, 138, 233, 264.
Life, origin of, 48, 51, 53, 54.
  sprang from many centres, 64, 72.
Life and Matter, 49, 52.
Lodge, Sir Oliver, 44, 49, 51, 65, 130.
Loisy, M., 35, 184, 285.
Lower Niger and its Tribes, The, 233–235, 264–265.
Lux Mundi, 268.

Magic, 142, 149, 205.
  sympathetic, 149, 150, 154, 156.
Making of Religion, The, 138.
Man, Eolithic, 98, 99, 100; religion of, 135.
  Fall of, 33, 107, 108, 121–124, 222, 227, 228, 236, 239, 283.
  origin of, 92, 231, 232.
  Quaternary, 96, 101–109, 135–138.
    an artist, 103–107.
    religion of, 135–138, 164–166.
Manley, Rev. J. T., 38.
Matzebah, 161, 204, 219.
Max Müller, 138.
Menhirs, 110, 198.
Miller, Hugh, 25.
"Modernists," 184.
Monism, 5, 48, 50, 249.
Moses, 161, 198, 199, 211, 212, 218.
Mycenean civilisation, 112, 113, 115, 117.
Mystic Rose, The, 138.
Myth, Ritual, and Religion, 138.
Mythologists, school of, 138.

Nägeli, 44, 59.
Native Tribes of South-East Australia, The, 147.
Nature and Origin of Living Matter, 54, 62.
Neolithic Age, 98, 109–115.
  art in, 112–115.
  religion in, 138–158.
Neolithic monuments in Europe, 110, 111, 151, 152.
"New Theology, The," 129, 130, 239, 241, 253, 259–262.
Newton, Sir Isaac, 17.
Nicoll, Dr. Robertson, 241.
Norfolk Review, The, 288–294.

Old Testament, how to understand historically, 280–284, 289–291.
Old Testament, literature of, 184–189.
"Ontogeny and Phylogeny," 68, 82, 134, 135.
Origin of Species, 58.
Orr, Prof., *God's Image in Man*, 27, 134.

Palæolithic Age, 98, 101–109, 118.
  art in, 103–107, 164–166.
  religion in, 135–138, 164–166.
Pangenesis, 58.
Paradise Lost, 94.
Perthes, M. Boucher de, 95, 102.
Petrie, Prof., 183, 192.
Pfleiderer, Prof., 255.

Piette, M., 113.
Pinches, Dr., 278.
Pithecanthropus erectus, 93, 128.
Primitive Art in Egypt, 113.
Primitive Christianity, 255–257.
Primitive Culture, 138, 297.
Prophetic history, the, 185.
Prophets in Israel, 216 *sqq.*
  universal in primitive religion, 170, 216, 217.

Radium, 72–76.
Rashdall, Rev. Hastings, 301.
Reconciliations, attempted, between Genesis and Science, 23–26, 33–40, 134.
Reinach, M. Salomon, 104, 166.
Re-incarnation, Arunta belief in, 145.
Religion, environment, influence on, 234–235.
  evolution of, 225.
  origin of, 108 *sqq.*, 232–236.
Researches in Sinai, 199.
Reuss, 180.
Reynolds, Prebendary, 134.
Riddle of the Universe, The, 249.
Rutherford, Prof., 75, 76.
  on *The Evolution of Matter*, 75.

Sacrament and sacrifice, 154.
  essence of, is communion, 155, 168, 169.
Sacraments, true meaning of, 251–255, 267–268.
Sacrifice, human, 197, 201.
  meaning of, 221, 225, 226.
St. Paul: the Man and his Work, 19, 20, 258.
Saleeby, Dr., 50, 140.
  on the Origin of Religion, 140.
Samson, 29.
Satan, 222, 223, 226.
Schliemann, Dr., 112.
Schmidt, Prof., on the "Jerahmeel" theory, 211, 212.
Scientific Temper in Religion, The, 79.
Sea-water and blood, 56, 57.
Selby Abbey, 47.
Sin, original, 27, 31, 194, 222, 227, 228, 236, 237, 238–245, 283.
  essence of, 237–245.
  growing sense of, during and after Exile, 221–224.
  "natural," 243.
  sense of, in more advanced races, 246.
Sisera, 162.
Smith, Prof. G. A., 288.
Sollas, Prof., 64.
Song of the Well, 192.
Song of Deborah, 191, 201.
Souls, belief as to, 148, 157, 158.
Spencer and Gillen, Messrs., 138, 297.
Spencer, Herbert, 17, 44, 49, 50, 51, 60, 140, 141.
Standard, the, 298.
Story of Art throughout the Ages, The, 104–107, 164–166.
Substance of Faith, The, 130.
Synopsis of Lectures, 13–15.

Tanganyika Natives, The, 166, 167.
"Ten Words, The," 199, 200, 230, 295, 296.
Tennant, Rev. F. R., 244, 245.
Teraphim, 198.
Testimony of the Rocks, 25.
Totemism, 142, 143, 155.
  in Israel, 162, 163.
Tree of Life, The, 138, 167, 238, 239.
Tree-worship, 153, 156, 157.
Tylor, Prof., 138, 297.
Tyndall, Prof., 40.
Tyrrell, Rev. G., 184.

Universe, pre-scientific view of, 17–20.

Universe, modern view of, 36–38.
"Urim and Thummim," 162.

Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication, 58.

Waggett, Father, 79–83.
Wallace, 44.
Weinel, *St. Paul: the Man and his Work*, 19, 258.
Weismann, 44, 45, 59, 60, 66, 69, 237, 245.
Wellhausen, 180, 181, 276.
Wernle, Dr., 225, 257.
Why not face the Facts? 6–8, 36, 37.
Wirreenun, 145.
prophets of Israel as, 162.
Witchcraft, 205–208, 296–298.
Wood-Martin, *Traces of the Elder Faiths of Ireland*, 156, 157.

Yahweh, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 218, 219, 223, 235, 244.
Yahweh, cult of, in old Israel, 203–208.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, *Edinburgh*

Recently Published. In post 8vo, price 3s. 6d. net.

TO CHRIST THROUGH CRITICISM.

BY

RICHARD W. SEAVER, M.A., B.D.,

Scholar and Senior Moderator in Mental and Moral Science; Donnellan Lecturer, Trinity College, Dublin; Rector of St. John's, Malone, Belfast.

Containing the substance of the Donnellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin.

Contents :—The New Theology—Results of Criticism—Authority in Religion—The Christ of History—The Miraculous Element—The Resurrection Fact—The Resurrection Form—The Meaning of the Death—The Christian Character—Bibliography—Index.

'The work of a scholarly, thoughtful, and broad-minded man. Pleasant to read, simple, and judicious.'—*Church Family Newspaper.*

'Prolific as recent years have been in books designed to show the influence of criticism on Christian Faith, we should give this a high place among the best, especially for those readers whose great need is a lucid and balanced statement of the case, free from unnecessary technicalities.'—*Christian World.*

'No one can read this book without being impressed with the ability, acumen, and spiritual gifts of the writer, and for many people in the present distress this will be a most useful volume.'—*British Congregationalist.*

Order Now from your Bookseller

THE NEW DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.

COMPLETE IN ONE VOLUME.

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

Which will be published in Autumn, 1908.

This Dictionary is entirely distinct from the Five-Volume Dictionary.

It is complete in ONE Volume.

The Articles are all new.

Many of the Authors are the same as in the large Dictionary, but they have not written on the same Subjects.

It is not based on any other Dictionary, but is a wholly new and original Work.

Every Article is signed by the Author. This is the first time that all the Articles in a single-volume Dictionary of the Bible have been committed to Specialists and bear their signatures, as in the largest Dictionaries.

The price of the large Volume (800 or 900 pages), in handsome Cloth Binding, will be **20s.** net.

Prospectus, with Specimen Page and List of Authors, post free on application.

Just Published. Post 8vo, **4s. 6d.** net.

JESUS CHRIST THE SON OF GOD.

Sermons and Interpretations.

By W. M. MACGREGOR, D.D., Edinburgh.

New Volume, 'THE SCHOLAR AS PREACHER' SERIES.

'Dr. Macgregor's book we have read with great delight. It is rich, ripe, full, wise, and thoughtful. . . We doubt whether any first book of Sermons published during the last ten years will receive a greater welcome than this mellow, meditative, and yet inspiring record of devout and faithful thought.'—*British Weekly.*

MESSRS. CLARK are publishing a New Series entitled—

THE
LITERATURE AND RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

EDITED BY JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

The First Volume published is—

By Professor W. H. BENNETT, Litt.D., D.D., London.

The Religion of the Post-Exilic Prophets.

Now ready. In post 8vo, 6s. net.

'Dr. Bennett has executed his task with judgment and skill, and his book is an extremely valuable guide to the knowledge of Hebrew prophecy in its later developments.' —*Manchester Guardian.*

The other Volumes will be—

By Professor MORRIS JASTROW, University of Pennsylvania.

Foundations.

By Professor A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., Edinburgh.

Institutions and Legislation.

By Professor HOPE W. HOGG, Manchester.

History.

By Professor BUCHANAN GRAY, M.A., D.D., Oxford.

Psalms.

By Professor R. H. KENNETT, M.A., B.D., Cambridge.

Pre-Exilic Prophets.

By Professor JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Cambridge.

Wisdom Literature.

By JAMES MOFFATT, M.A., D.D., Broughty-Ferry.

Historical Apologues.

By Professor R. H. CHARLES, D.D., Oxford.

Apocalyptic Literature. Two Vols.

A Prospectus of this Series will be forwarded, post free, to any address.

The Early Traditions of Genesis. By Prof. A. R. GORDON, Litt.D., Presbyterian College, Montreal. Just Published. Post 8vo, price 6s. net.

An estimation of the value of the narratives afresh in the light of modern research. It aims, in the first instance, at ascertaining, in objective, scientific fashion, their real character and significance. The emphasis has, however, been laid on the moral and religious character of the narratives, and the author has sought to do more justice than is often allowed to these traditions as the first bright rays that heralded the coming of the full-orbed light of the world.

'Prof. Gordon's theories show great learning and ingenuity, and the whole book is well worth careful study.'—*Spectator.*

The Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul. His Ministerial Ideals. By W. E. Chadwick, D.D., Vicar of St. Giles, Northampton. Author of 'The Social Teaching of St. Paul.' In post 8vo, price 7s. 6d. net.

Prof. H. B. Swete, D.D., of Cambridge, writes: 'I hope this book will be widely read by the clergy. It is just the kind of study that ought to be useful.'

New Light on the New Testament. From Records of the Græco-Roman Period. By Prof. Adolf Deissmann, D.D., Heidelberg. Author of 'Bible Studies.' In crown 8vo, price 3s. net.

'The impartial reader must feel that this book fully justifies its title, as Prof. Deissmann is at the same time the pioneer and the most brilliant exponent of the branch of research which it represents.'—*Christian World.*

Canon and Text of the New Testament. By Caspar René Gregory, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the University of Leipzig. New Volume, 'International Theological Library.' In post 8vo, price 12s.

'This substantial volume fully maintains the high standard of scholarship which has hitherto distinguished this well-known series. . . . A brilliant contribution to New Testament scholarship.'—*Scotsman.*

'Dr. Gregory has every qualification for the laborious task that he set before himself in planning this remarkable work on the evidence that underlies the Canon and Text of the New Testament, and it may be said at once that his labour of love has been crowned with complete success.'—*Contemporary Review.*

The Religious Teachers of Greece. The Gifford Lectures. By the late James Adam, M.A., Litt.D.(Camb.), LL.D., Fellow, Lecturer, and Senior Tutor of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. With Biographical Sketch of the Author. [*In the Press.*

Sermons in Hebrew Syntax. By the Rev. John Adams, B.D., Author of 'Sermons in Accents.' Crown 8vo, price 4s. 6d. net.

This work has been designed as a second or supplementary volume to the Author's former treatise on Hebrew Accentuation. As a mine of homiletic suggestion, the accentual system cannot compare for a moment with the ever-varying light and shade of Hebrew Syntax. Those who deal with the minutiæ of the text will never lack sermons.

Wycliffe and the Lollards. By the Rev. J. C. Carrick, B.D., Newbattle. New Volume, 'The World's Epoch-Makers' Series. Price 3s. [*In the Press. Nearly Ready.*

Just published, Demy 8vo. Price 7s. 6d. net.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN OUTLINE.

By Prof. W. ADAMS BROWN, Ph.D., D.D.,
Union Theological Seminary, New York.

"This book owes its origin to a practical purpose. It is the outgrowth of the author's experience as a teacher of theology, and is the attempt to meet a definite need which that experience disclosed,—that, namely, of a brief handbook, at once scientific and constructive, in which the subject-matter of Christian theology should be treated from the modern point of view, and the new conceptions affecting Christian thought should be set forth in their inner consistency, and in their true relation to their antecedents in the past. . . . I have not been unmindful of the wider public who are interested in theological questions. Many thoughtful laymen to-day desire to know how the great convictions which form the subject-matter of the Christian faith appear when regarded from the modern, that is to say, scientific, point of view. This question the book attempts to answer."—From the Author's Preface.

"Of recent books on Christian Theology, this new work is in many respects the best. It is alive to the present intellectual conditions, and speaks in the language of the time. It is an excellent handbook for a theological class, and there must be thousands of non-professional readers also who will find it an absorbing and profitable study. . . . Everywhere the sincere, cautious, and responsible utterance of a man who has often been over the field, and who knows what he is doing."—*British Weekly.*

In Demy 8vo. Price 6s. net.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL:

Its Purpose and Theology.

By the Rev. ERNEST F. SCOTT, B.A., Prestwick.

"One of the most instructive and suggestive studies of the Fourth Gospel that has appeared in later New Testament criticism. . . . Written from a thorough knowledge both of the sources and of the later authorities on this subject."—*Christian World.*

"The most elaborate and thorough-going treatment of the whole theology of the Fourth Gospel that has yet appeared in English. He has put the theological world under a debt of gratitude to him for supplying the best solution of the problems of the Fourth Gospel."—*Glasgow Herald.*

Post 8vo, with Map. Price 6s. net.

THE GOSPEL HISTORY AND ITS TRANSMISSION.

By F. CRAWFORD BURKITT, M.A., D.D.,
Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

"We have read Prof. Burkitt's Lectures with the keenest delight and gratitude, and warmly recommend them to all who are faced with the difficulties of the apparent conflict between Faith and Knowledge."—*Standard.*

"The most satisfactory treatment of the subject in English . . . is an unusually full book, an excellent specimen of well-informed, thoughtful, and moderate English criticism."—*British Weekly.*

"A welcome contribution to the literature which has grown up around the New Testament."—*Scotsman.*

Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Price 2s. 6d. net.

WHAT ABOUT THE NEW THEOLOGY?

By the REV. W. L. WALKER,

AUTHOR OF *The Cross and the Kingdom; The Spirit and the Incarnation, etc.*

This volume is an estimate of, and a reply to, Rev. R. J. Campbell's **New Theology** from the standpoint of liberal, but decided, Evangelicalism. Few scholars are more competent to write such a reply than Mr. Walker, as for many years he has made a careful study of the subjects Mr. Campbell writes upon, and he has no difficulty in dealing convincingly with them.

The *Christian Commonwealth* says: "Of the three books which lie before us, we may—and indeed must—say at once that only one (Mr. Walker's) strikes us as being in any sense a contribution to the subject. In reading his pages we have the sensation that this is no partisan or retained pleader, but a Christian thinker solely and entirely concerned to elucidate the truth to the best of his ability."

In Crown 8vo. Price 3s. net.

NEW LIGHT ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

From Records of the Græco-Roman Period.

By Professor ADOLF DEISSMANN, D.D., Heidelberg,

AUTHOR OF *Bible Studies.*

AUTHORISED TRANSLATION.

CONTENTS:—The Problem—Nature of the Evidence. The Importance of the Texts for the Philological Interpretation of the N.T. The Importance of the Texts for the Literary Interpretation of the N.T. The Importance of the Texts for the Religious Interpretation of the N.T. Recapitulation—Problems for Future Investigation.

In Post 8vo. Price 4s. 6d. net.

THE STOIC CREED.

By WILLIAM L. DAVIDSON, LL.D.,

Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, University of Aberdeen.

New Volume, "RELIGION IN LITERATURE AND LIFE" SERIES.

"This volume will take its place as, for the present, the best account of the Stoic philosophy, the Stoic morality, and the Stoic religion."—*Cambridge Review.*

"A very valuable work, which the Christian preacher will find it of the greatest advantage to study."—*Christian World.*

New Volume just published. Price 3s. net.

ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

From the Death of King Charles I. to the Death of King William III., 1649–1702.

By ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.,

Late Master of University College, Durham.

"Dr. Alfred Plummer has read very widely, and he has the art of seizing the salient points and making them emphatic by a sharpness of phrase, or an aptness of quotation, which helps to fix them in the memory. There is no wonder that these lectures have been widely popular. They are eminently candid, judicious and unprejudiced."—W. H. HUTTON, B.D., Fellow and Tutor, St. John's College, Oxford (in the *Journal of Theological Studies*).

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, & CO. LTD.

OUTLINES OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

By W. Sanday, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Lady Margaret Professor, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Second Edition. In post 8vo, price 5s. net.

Although this book is, in the main, a reprint of Dr. Sanday's well-known article, 'Jesus Christ,' in Dr. Hastings' Bible Dictionary, the Author has worked carefully over the material, and has broken up the text into Chapters and Sections. An important new Map of Palestine is added.

Contents :—Chap. I. Introductory.—II. Survey of Conditions.—III. The Early Ministry.—IV. Teaching and Miracles.—V. The Later Ministry.—VI. The Messianic Crisis.—VII. Supplemental Matter: The Nativity and Infancy.—VIII. The Verdict of History.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

Introductory and Expository Studies. By the Rev. R. D. Shaw, D.D., Edinburgh. Second Edition. 8vo, price 8s. net.

'Of all the Introductions to St. Paul's Epistles I have read, this is the best.'—*Methodist Times.*

'Ought to prove a very useful guide to the professional student as well as to the inquiring layman. Nothing essential is missed which could aid the student to understand the circumstances which evoked the letters and the aim they sought to achieve.'—*British Weekly.*

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

In Christian Truth and Life. By the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., Warden of Bermondsey Settlement. 8vo, price 8s. net.

This book is an attempt to establish the Fatherhood of God as the determining fact of Christian life and the determining principle of Christian Theology. Among the subjects dealt with are: The New Testament Doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. Place in New Testament Theology. The Relation of the Old Testament Doctrine to the Fatherhood of God. The Doctrine in Church History. Validity and Content. Manifestation.

'Every reader will own the masterly skill with which Mr. Lidgett handles his subject, the breadth of his reasoning, the wide knowledge which he brings to bear on every page of his work, and the zeal which fuses and transfuses the whole.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

AN ANNOUNCEMENT OF GREAT IMPORTANCE.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK have pleasure in making this preliminary announcement of what will undoubtedly be the most important Work of its kind ever issued. It is—

An Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, D.D., with the assistance of JOHN A. SELBIE, D.D., and of other Scholars in each Department.

Its purpose is to give an account of all religious and ethical beliefs, and all religious and moral practices throughout the world. It will not merely contain articles on the great religions of the world. It will contain articles also on every religious custom and conception, and it will contain a most important series of comparative articles on great topics in Religion and Morals.

Scholars and specialists in almost every country in the world are now engaged in its preparation, and the Editors hope to make this Encyclopædia indispensable to those who are engaged in writing or speaking or social work, and especially to those who are engaged in teaching or preaching. *But it is offered to every man and woman who has any interest in the history of human progress, or in the present moral or spiritual well-being of mankind.*